DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 930 UD 033 603

TITLE	Educating the Disadvantaged. Hearing of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions on Examining Legislation Authorizing Funds for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Focusing on Title I, Education Programs for the Disadvantaged. United States Senate, One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-106-23
ISBN	ISBN-0-16-058403-5
PUB DATE	1999-03-19
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sale Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; Standards; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Reauthorization Legislation; Senate

ABSTRACT

The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions met to consider the largest program within the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards. At this hearing, how Title I funds are spent, who they serve, and whether student performance is improving were topics discussed. After introductory remarks by Senators James M. Jeffords (Vermont), Christopher J. Dodd (Connecticut), Patty Murray (Washington), and Susan M. Collins (Maine), a panel of experts testified about the funding and impact of Title I. Wayne Riddle of the Congressional Research Service gave an overview of Title I. David Baroudi, Vermont's Title I director, discussed the important role of Title I and the need to integrate it with other education programs. Lula Ford, the Title I director for the Chicago, Illinois, schools discussed the way Title I related to overall reform efforts. William Taylor of the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights suggested needed changes for the upcoming reauthorization of Title I. The final witness, Terry Bergeson, chief state school officer of Washington, presented her perspective on Title 1 and its relationship to other state and federal education programs. Prepared statements of these witnesses follow their testimony. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

S. Hrg. 106-23

EDUCATING THE DISADVANTAGED

ED 441 930

HEARING

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINING LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, FOCUSING ON TITLE I, EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

MARCH 16, 1999

Printed for the use of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
55-562 CC
WASHINGTON : 1999

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-058403-5

UD033603

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont, *Chairman*

JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
BILL FRIST, Tennessee
MIKE DeWINE, Ohio
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island

MARK E. POWDEN, *Staff Director*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Deputy Staff Director*
J. MICHAEL MYERS, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1999

Page

Jeffords, Hon. James M., Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, opening statement 1
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, prepared statement 3
Dodd, Hon. Christopher J., a U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut, opening statement 5
Murray, Hon. Patty, a U.S. Senator from the State of Washington, opening statement 7
  Prepared statement 8
Collins, Hon. Susan M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Maine, opening statement 8
Riddle, Wayne, specialist in education finance, domestic social policy division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; David Baroudi, State director of Title I Programs, Department of Education, Montpelier, VT; Lula M. Ford, school leadership development official, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL; William L. Taylor, vice chair, Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, DC; and Terry Bergeson, State superintendent of public instruction, Olympia, WA, on behalf of the Council of Chief State School Officers 9
  Prepared statements of:
    Mr. Riddle 12
    Mr. Baroudi 20
    Ms. Ford 24
    Mr. Taylor 29
    Ms. Bergeson 37
Hinckley, June M., president, MENC: The National Association for Music Education, prepared statement 70
Rauscher, Dr. Frances, assistant professor of cognitive development, University of Wisconsin, prepared statement 71

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Articles, publications, letters, etc.:
  Responses of Ms. Bergeson to questions asked by Senator Murray 39
  A legislative proposal for Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act 72

EDUCATING THE DISADVANTAGED

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1999

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:37 a.m., in room SD–430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Jeffords (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jeffords, Collins, Dodd, Wellstone, and Murray.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEFFORDS

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will come to order.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the most important education legislation we will consider this year. The Federal Government currently spends approximately $15 billion on programs related to elementary and secondary education. That is a substantial commitment, and it is a critical one for us here today.

Throughout our history, we have recognized the importance of investing in education. Thomas Jefferson said many times that education was the most effective means against tyranny. He wrote in 1818, "If the children...are untaught, their ignorance and vices will, in future life, cost us much dearer in their consequences than it would have done, in their correction, by a good education."

This morning, we will devote our attention to the largest program within the ESEA—Title I, Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards. The Title I program has been the cornerstone of the ESEA since its inception in 1965. Its purpose is to provide supplementary educational services to educationally disadvantaged children.

As part of the Senate report accompanying the 1965 ESEA bill, the committee wrote in support of the establishment of Title I that, "The solution...lies in the ability of our local elementary and secondary school systems to provide for a high quality program of instruction in the basic educational skills....The reported bill is designed to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most."

Over the past 34 years, it has, in fact, provided millions of American children with the extra help they need to take full advantage of educational opportunities. Today, over 10 million students participate in Title I activities, and the program currently receives close to $8 billion in Federal funds.

As we embark upon a new century, we find that the basic challenge which faced those who sat in our chairs over three decades ago remains with us. We are trying to figure out how we most effectively promote educational programs and strategies that close the education achievement gap.

Title I can and should be instrumental in meeting that challenge. Every child, without regard to their economic or social background, deserves a quality education.

Hearings such as this one we are holding today are a critical part of the committee's efforts to shape a reauthorization bill which will meet the needs of the future. We must evaluate the successes and failures of programs on the books as well as explore new ideas and approaches.

Today's panel will greatly assist our work by addressing the following questions: How are Title I moneys being spent? Who is being served? Is student performance improving? What types of professional development efforts are underway for Title I teachers? And how can we improve the current program?

I am especially pleased that we will hear today both rural and urban perspectives about the inner workings of the Title I program.

My home State of Vermont has over 8,000 students enrolled in Title I programs. The director of these students, David Baroudi, will discuss the important role Title I has played in improving school and student performance and the need to integrate Title I with other education programs.

I am also delighted that Lula Ford, the city of Chicago Title I director, is here with us today. I visited the Chicago school district last year and look forward to hearing about their Title I program and how it relates to their overall school reform efforts.

I welcome the other witnesses as well. Each of these witnesses will help members of the committee gain a better insight into the performance of a program in which we have invested billions of dollars in the hopes of assuring that every American school child has an opportunity to succeed.

I would like to call forward our panel of experts.

Mr. Wayne Riddle is a specialist in education finance with the Congressional Research Service, CRS. He has played a major role in every ESEA reauthorization since I have been here in Congress. His guidance and expertise have been invaluable, and I would like to take the opportunity to thank him for all his efforts and look forward to working with him closely during the 1999 reauthorization. Today, Mr. Riddle will provide us with an overview of the Title I program.

Next we will hear from David Baroudi. Mr. Baroudi is the Title I director for my home State of Vermont. He has played a key role in Vermont's elementary and secondary policy development for 20 years. I look forward to hearing from Dr. Baroudi about the impact of the Title I program on rural States.

Following Mr. Baroudi, we will hear from Lula Ford, the school leadership development official with the Chicago Public Schools. Ms. Ford heads up the Title I program and has been instrumental in developing Chicago's school reform strategy. I enjoyed my visit with you there and was impressed and I look forward to your testimony.

Our fourth witness will be William Taylor, Vice Chair of the Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights. Last fall the commission issued a preliminary report assessing the Title I program and the changes that were implemented in the last reauthorization. I look forward to hearing from Mr. Taylor and hearing his suggestions for the upcoming reauthorization.

Our final witness will be Dr. Terry Bergeson, who is the chief school State officer with the State of Washington. She will give us her perspective on the Title I program and its relationship to other State and Federal education programs.

I welcome you all, and as you may know, your prepared statements will be entered into the record. We do like you to try and keep your statements close to 5 minutes, and we have a little light system here which will let you know how you are doing. We appreciate having you all here. The ESEA is an extremely important piece of legislation, and the most important part in many people's minds is Title I.

So, with that, we will proceed with Wayne——

[The prepared statement of Senator Kennedy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

I regret that I could not attend the hearing today. I commend Chairman Jeffords for giving this high priority to helping disadvantaged children obtain a good education.

In 1994, we made significant changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to support the development and implementation of high standards for all children. As a result, States and communities are making significant progress in improving their public schools.

The most recent National Assessment of Title I shows that student achievement is increasing—and that the Federal Government is an effective partner in that success. This is good news for schools, good news for parents, and good news for students—and it should encourage Congress to do more to build on these successes, so that every child has the opportunity to get a good education,

As the largest Federal investment in improving elementary and secondary schools, Title I helps improve education for 11 million children in 45,000 schools with high concentrations of poverty. It helps schools provide professional development for teachers, improve curriculums, increase parent involvement, and extend learning time, so that students meet high State standards of achievement.

Under the 1994 amendments to Title I, States are no longer allowed to set lower standards for children in the poorest communities than for students in more affluent communities. The results are clear, Students will do well when expectations are set high and they receive the support they need.

Student achievement in reading and math has increased—particularly the achievement of the poorest students. Since 1992, reading achievement for 9-year-olds in the highest poverty schools has increased by a whole grade level nationwide. Between 1990 and 1996, math scores of the poorest students also rose by a grade level.

Students are meeting higher State standards, too. According to State-reported results, students in the highest poverty elementary schools improved in 5 of 6 States reporting 3-year data in reading—and in 4 out of 5 States in math. Students in Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, and Texas made progress in both subjects.

Many urban school districts report that achievement also improved in their highest-poverty schools. In 10 out of 13 large urban districts that report 3-year trend data, more elementary students in the highest poverty schools met district or State standards of proficiency in reading or math. Six districts, including Houston, Dade County, New York, Philadelphia, San Antonio, and San Francisco, made progress in both subjects.

Federal funds are increasingly targeted to the poorest schools. The 1994 amendments to Title I shifted funds away from low-poverty schools and into high-poverty schools. Today, 95 percent of the highest-poverty schools receive Title I funds, up from 80 percent in 1993.

In addition, Title I funds help improve teaching and learning in the classroom. Ninety-nine percent of Title I funds go to the local level, 93 percent of those Federal dollars are spent directly on instruction, while only 62 percent of all State and local education dollars are spent on instruction.

We need to build on these successes to ensure that every child gets a good education. Families across the Nation want Uncle Sam to be a partner—a helping hand in these efforts. Parents are impatient about results—they want their communities, States, and the Federal Government to work together to improve public schools, In doing our Federal part, we should ensure that when we provide more flexibility, it is matched with strong accountability for results, so that every parent knows their children are getting the education they deserve.

We must also continue our commitment to helping the neediest students and communities. Whether the issue is academic achievement, flexibility, access to technology, teacher quality, modem buildings, or safe facilities, we must do all we can to ensure that we close the education gap between the "have's" and the "have-nots."

We must do more to meet the needs of schools, families, and children, so that all children can attend good schools and meet high standards of achievement. We need to continue our investment in helping communities reduce class sizes, particularly in the early grades. We need to help provide safe, modem facilities and up-to-date technology. We need to support worthwhile after-school opportunities for children who require extra help. We need to help bring more well-trained teachers into classrooms across the country who are up-to-date on current developments in their field and on the best teaching practices.

Senator DODD. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. You would like to make a statement, I bet. All right.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Senator DODD. Let me just first of all apologize for my short appearance here and for Senator Kennedy. Senator Kennedy will try and get by, but we are both meeting in a few minutes with some of the leaders of Northern Ireland who are here this week for St. Patrick's Day and at an obviously critical stage in trying to resolve the remaining issues of the conflict in Northern Ireland. And so he asked me to apologize. You know of his deep interest in this subject.

Just very briefly, let me first of all thank all of our witnesses and the people in our audience who are with us this morning, as well as thank you, Mr. Chairman, as we continue to hold this set of important hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, particularly Title I, which is the most critical, in my view, of all of the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is the largest single Federal education program, funded at $8 billion and serving 11 million children across the country. Of the 52 or 53 million children this morning who are at school, one out of five of them will be the beneficiary of Title I funding one way or another. And so it is a very critical program and one that we rightfully spend some time examining how well it is working and what suggestions and changes we might make in order to improve it.

When we make assessments of the future with some 290 days to the new millennium, we are constantly asking what the future will look like. There is all sorts of data and information that spews out almost on an hourly basis with different predictions for the coming millennium or the coming century. But for those of you who want to get a really good look, at least in the near term, of what our future will look like, just take a walk into any elementary or secondary school classroom today, and you would get a pretty good idea.

By and large, Mr. Chairman—I am sure this is true in Vermont, and I know it is true in Connecticut—it is a pretty good picture. We have spent a lot of time focusing on, as we should, where there are shortcomings in our schools. But we do not spend much time talking about what really works and what is going well. And, by and large, if you look into most classrooms, things are going pretty well.

Unfortunately, that is not true everywhere, and so we have to spend some time looking at where those shortcomings are occurring and how we can see to it that things improve. So our job here in this committee is to try and listen to those of you who are out there every day working in these areas and then see if we cannot come up with some suggestions and ideas on how to strengthen these programs to see to it that all of America's children, whether they be in urban or rural schools, suburban communities, affluent communities, poor communities, are getting that equal opportunity that an education provides so they will have a good chance, a good start in life.

In my State of Connecticut, you understand, Mr. Chairman, that we take a little bit of pride that in these recent test results that have come out. Connecticut now leads the Nation in several key measures of student achievement. In results released a week or so ago, Connecticut far surpassed many other States in the Nation in reading achievement in 4th and 8th graders. Early this year, it was announced that our 4th graders led the Nation in math. I cannot believe it is a coincidence that these gains have been seen in the last few years as standards-based reforms have taken root in Connecticut's schools. I think there is a direct relationship to that.

We should celebrate these successes and those of other States and schools, but we cannot rest on them. In reading scores, Connecticut did exceptionally well in comparison to other States. But let me quickly add that only 46 percent of 4th graders scored above the basic and a full 22 percent scored below the basic. Now, that is Connecticut. That is the best State in the country.

So while we have a certain sense of pride about doing well by comparison, I do not consider 46 percent of 4th graders scoring at the basic level and almost one out of four scoring below the basic level to be any great achievement nationally as we end this century. So we need to do a lot better.

Let me just mention a few other things that I think we ought to consider as we look at this legislation, Mr. Chairman.

We need to ensure that our teachers are trained and supported in their efforts to teach to the high standards that have been set in States and communities across this country. In my view, this means smaller classes, stronger professional development, better training for new teachers, and support in mentoring as teachers enter the classroom.

No. 2, we should also ensure that our school facilities are up to this challenge, that they are safe, well-equipped, and good places to learn. It is outrageous, in my view, absolutely outrageous, that as we end the 20th century we have a staggering number of schools in this country that are just falling apart as buildings. In this, the greatest, strongest, most affluent Nation during the greatest period of economic growth and strength, we still have far too many of our elementary and secondary schools falling apart.

There is absolutely no excuse for that, in my view, and I am hopeful that in this legislation this year we will turn that issue around.

I know my colleague from Washington has spent a lot of time on this issue, and I commend her for it. It just should not go on. It is a national embarrassment.

We must assure that parents are empowered to be real partners in their children's education. We know this is critical to the success of schools, and yet parent involvement still drops off once a child enters school. It goes from about 80 percent in Head Start down to about 20 percent in the 1st grade. It is like falling off a cliff in terms of parental involvement. That should change, in my view, and I am hopeful in this bill we can do something about it.

Fourth, we face the difficult challenges of responding to failing schools with real consequences and meaningful reform. Chicago—and we are delighted, Ms. Ford, that you are here—has been a model in this area, and I am eager to hear more about it from our witnesses today on how we can take good examples that have worked around the country.

We need to support schools as they explore innovative and successful programs like character education. Senator Domenici and I and others have promoted this, Mr. Chairman, as a pilot program, and I can tell you in my State where we have a number of schools now, elementary and secondary schools, that have adopted Character Counts as a program, it works. It works fabulously. I hope that we can maybe expand this now to a national program beyond the pilot effort.

I think we should do more to ensure that young children enter school ready to learn. We have started on that road. We can do a lot more, in my view.

We need to assist communities in meeting the needs of children during out-of-school hours to ensure that gains in the school day are built on rather than lost to gangs, teen pregnancy, and alcohol.

And, most importantly, and last, we need to continue the historic Federal efforts on ensuring that no child, particularly no poor children, children with disabilities, or those with limited English proficiency, are left behind. I am particularly interested in the bilingual programs, Mr. Chairman, and which ones are working and which ones are not working and why. Again, I am impressed with the Chicago effort, and they have gotten away from the use of bilingual, because that in itself conjures up all sorts of constituencies that make it sometimes difficult to follow through in these areas. But it is a critical issue with more and more children coming to our country with limited English ability as they need to get underway if they are going to succeed.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, again, I thank you for holding these hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murray, I understand you would like to say something about one of our great witnesses.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY

Senator MURRAY. I would, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much. Thank you for having this very important hearing. This issue is one that is absolutely critical as we get into the ESEA reauthorization.

But I would especially like to welcome Dr. Terry Bergeson from my home State of Washington who is here today. Dr. Bergeson and I have worked together for many years on education and children's issues, and I am delighted that she has the opportunity to talk to you about some of the things happening in our State of Washington. She really is a visionary and a hard worker, and I think you will learn a lot from listening to her.

When I was in my State senate in the late 1980s, we were putting together our State-designed education reform, and Dr. Bergeson had been key in implementing that education reform in our State.

She led the Commission on Student Learning that established goals and assessments by working closely with community leaders from all over my State. She is a publicly elected superintendent, and she has really brought some system changes to our education system in the State of Washington that have achieved higher standards and helped teachers and communities at every level. And I am very proud of her work and am delighted to have her with us today and for all of you to hear what she has to say, along with all the other members of the panel.

So thank you very much for having her today.

[The prepared statement of Senator Murray follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for having this important hearing today on an issue at the core of the Federal role in education—the education of the disadvantaged. Improving equity is one of the main purposes of our educational efforts in this committee, and we must continue to tie those improvements to State and local efforts to improve student learning in general.

The news about Title I has been good, although there are challenges as there are with any effort of this scope. The dollars are targeted—we know that they get to the schools and the students with the greatest needs. And, we know that especially since 1994, Title I is working nicely to support educational reform plans in the States—supporting both the vision of State reform to improve student achievement, and supporting that vision with resources.

We will be fortunate today to hear from the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Washington State, Dr. Terry Bergeson. Dr. Bergeson and I work closely together on issues of education reform, educational technology, and in better involving students as partners in their own education. She is a visionary, a hard worker, a change agent, and a very compassionate person who always keeps the student and the student's family in mind.

When I was a State Senator in the late 1980s, we were beginning to put together the State-designed education reform effort that is improving student success today. Dr. Bergeson has been key to helping to implement education reform in my State.

She led the Commission on Student Learning to establish goals and assessments by working closely with community leaders from Bellingham to Walla Walla.

As our publicly-elected Superintendent, she has brought about the systems changes that support the new higher standards and help teachers at the community level to help students achieve.

She is a leader the rest of the Nation can learn from. Thank you, Superintendent Bergeson for being here today.

Thanks again to the Chair and the Ranking Member, Senator Kennedy for all their great work on the issues we discuss today, and for working with Dr. Bergeson and myself to help improve student learning for children all across the country today and in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Collins.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR COLLINS

Senator COLLINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for holding this important hearing.

I have in Maine an Education Advisory Committee that I convene periodically. At our last meeting, I asked them for an overview of many the issues we would be facing this year as we reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. To a person, whether it was the teachers or the principals or the school board members or the superintendent of schools or the dean of the College of Education at the University of Maine, every single one of them told me that we have a long ways to go in making Title I effective.

It was very interesting. It was the only issue that we discussed on which there was unanimity, so I look forward to these hearings and helping the chairman, Senator Dodd, Senator Murray, and others who are interested in this issue to craft a more effective program for our low-income children.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Collins.

We will start with Mr. Riddle.

STATEMENTS OF WAYNE RIDDLE, SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION FINANCE, DOMESTIC SOCIAL POLICY DIVISION, CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, DC; DAVID BAROUDI, STATE DIRECTOR OF TITLE I PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, MONTPELIER, VT; LULA M. FORD, SCHOOL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OFFICIAL, CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CHICAGO, IL; WILLIAM L. TAYLOR, VICE CHAIR, CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON, DC; AND TERRY BERGESON, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, OLYMPIA, WA, ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Mr. RIDDLE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Wayne Riddle. I am a specialist in education finance with the Congressional Research Service. I appreciate your invitation to provide background information and a review of prospective reauthorization issues for Title I, Part A of the ESEA.

Title I funds are used to provide supplementary educational services to pupils at public schools with relatively high concentrations of children from low-income families, as well as low-achieving pupils who live in the areas served by these public schools but who attend private schools.

Title I was last reauthorized and very substantially revised in 1994 under the Improving America's Schools Act, or IASA. For fiscal year 1999, the total funding for Title I, Part A, is $7.7 billion, an amount which has increased by approximately 16 percent since fiscal year 1995.

Title I grants or services are provided to approximately 90 percent of all local educational agencies in the Nation; to 45,000, or 58 percent, of all public schools; and to 11 million, or 22 percent, of all pupils, including approximately 167,000 pupils attending private schools. Four-fifths of all participating pupils are in pre-kindergarten through grade 6, with only 5 percent of participants in grades 10 through 12.

Title I has numerous requirements regarding such matters as selection of schools and pupils to be served, fiscal accountability, pupil assessment, program improvements, or parental involvement, but few or no requirements regarding such matters as instructional methods, program strategies, or staff qualifications, which are, therefore, left almost totally to State and local discretion. In other words, Title I is now, and always has been, essentially a funding mechanism, with various forms of encouragement, but no requirements, to employ any specific educational techniques or strategies.

In particular, there is no requirement to use instructional methods or strategies that have been proven effective through research.

LEAs can generally choose to focus Title I services on selected grade levels—for example, only in elementary schools—but they must also provide services in general in all public schools where the percentage of pupils from low-income families is 75 percent or more.

There are two basic formats for Title I programs.

In the traditional or targeted assistance programs, Title I services are focused on the lowest-achieving individual pupils in the school. For example, pupils may be pulled out of their regular classroom for several hours for more intensive instruction by a specialist teacher each week.

In contrast, in schoolwide programs, Title I funds may be used to improve the performance of all pupils in a school, and there is no requirement to focus services on only the most disadvantaged pupils. For example, funds might be used to provide professional development services to all of a school's teachers or to upgrade instructional technology schoolwide.

Currently, most participating schools are targeted assistance schools, but most pupils, and increasing proportions each year, are served by Title I schoolwide.

Now, the overarching questions for reauthorization of Title I are: whether the 1994 amendments, which, as I said, were very significant, under the IASA are being implemented as intended; are they moving the program toward substantially increased effectiveness; and how might they be improved or refined. Alternatively, should strategies other than those embodied in the IASA be adopted to improve the education of disadvantaged pupils?

The remainder of my testimony will focus on reauthorization issues arising from implementation of the major IASA provisions for Title I. I should emphasize that, given the early stage of the reauthorization process, the issues identified should be considered preliminary. Further, since we are still in the middle of implementing some of the most basic provisions of the 1994 amendments, most judgments concerning the impact of the IASA on Title I must be considered highly tentative.

During Congress' consideration of the IASA, there was widespread agreement that the program was not as effective as it should or could be, and the legislation was revised in several major respects. These included:

First, greater targeting of funds on high-poverty schools and LEAs;

Second, requiring States to adopt for Title I students and programs challenging curriculum content standards, pupil preliminary standards, and assessments linked to these, which were to be the same as the standards and assessments applied to all pupils;

Third, a renewed focus on program improvement requirements, with sanctions for schools and LEAs with inadequate performance, rewards authorized for those with especially good performance, along with expanded technical assistance intended to identify effective practices and disseminate information about them;

And finally, fourth, increased flexibility through expanded schoolwide programs and authority to waive other requirements.

The extent to which these major elements of the 1994 Title I amendments have been implemented varies widely. I will discuss each in turn.

First, the IASA contained a series of provisions intended to increase the share of funds going to schools and LEAs with the greatest needs.

Greater targeting of funds on high-poverty LEAs was to be accomplished through use of a new targeted grant allocation formula that would provide increased grants per poor child as the percentage or number of poor children in an LEA increases. However, annual appropriations acts have prevented use of the targeted grant formula, as well as a second formula adopted in 1994 that would reward States with low expenditure disparities among their LEAs.

Better targeting of Title I grants on areas with the highest rate of growth in poor children was to be through use of data from a new Census Bureau program of population updates. This provision has been implemented, but the impact has been highly constrained by special provisions in appropriations acts from fiscal years 1997 through 1999.

The IASA's third set of provisions regarding targeting, those intended to focus funds more on high-poverty schools within LEAs, have been the most thoroughly implemented of these targeting provisions, and as a result, the percentage of high-poverty schools receiving Title I grants has increased substantially. However, in a number of LEAs this shift toward higher-poverty schools has been constrained through waivers allowing the continuation of grants to relative low-poverty schools.

Reauthorization issues with respect to targeting include: What level of increased targeting on high-poverty schools and LEAs is appropriate and feasible to implement? What is the appropriate balance between the use of the most current census estimates versus stability of grants to lower-growth areas? And have the IASA's efforts to increase targeting within LEAs provided sufficient funds to meet the severe needs of schools with very high concentrations of poor pupils?

A second series of IASA provisions requires States participating in Title I to adopt curriculum content standards, pupil performance standards, and assessments linked to these.

The deadline for adopting the content of performance standards was fall 1997; for assessments, it is the fall of 2000. Currently, 48 States have met the content standards requirements and 21 have met the pupil performance standards requirements. A small number of States appear to be unable to set statewide standards that are applicable to all pupils.

While the Title I standards requirements are being implemented, the pace at which benchmarks have been set so far is slower than specified in the IASA. The major question is whether to continue supporting standards-based reform to Title I until they are more fully implemented and results are more clear, whether the schedule for implementation of standards, assessments, and accountability provisions can or should be accelerated, and how to deal with States that are unable to set statewide standards.

A third major issue area is program improvement and technical assistance. As I said earlier, the IASA expanded Title I program improvement provisions, although it put off full implementation of those until the assessments are in place, which will not be for another couple of years.

One particular aspect of debates about effective use of Title I funds that is drawing increasing attention is the hiring of teacher aids, who constitute about one-half of the staff hired with Title I funds. Only a minority of aides have bachelor's degrees or similar qualifications for instructional duties.

Questions for Title I reauthorization in this area include how to improve the coherence and effectiveness of activities intended to identify and disseminate information about effective practices, particularly through professional development for teachers, how to provide meaningful incentives for adoption of effective practices and improved performance while recognizing limits on Federal influence and maximizing State and local flexibility in carrying out Title I programs. An additional issue is whether the use of Title I funds to hire aids should be limited or career ladder programs be encouraged so that more aides might become qualified for instructional responsibilities.

The final area is flexibility, one that has been discussed at length over the last couple of weeks with the ed-flex bills. One of the most significant changes was the expansion of the schoolwide program provision in Title I in 1994. The IASA reduced the low-income pupil eligibility threshold for schoolwides from 75 to 50 percent in general. Waivers have allowed an additional group of schools below 50 percent to become schoolwides, and this format is becoming increasingly common and popular.

In addition, both the IASA and Goals 2000: Educate America Act provided authority for waivers of many Federal statutory or regulatory requirements.

Questions regarding flexibility in the reauthorization process include whether the increased flexibility is being used in ways that are increasing the academic achievement of disadvantaged pupils, whether the accountability requirements are consistent with the increased flexibility in schoolwide programs, and, finally, whether there should be any change in the 50 percent low-income pupil percentage generally required to qualify for a schoolwide program.

I will stop at that point. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Riddle.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Riddle follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WAYNE RIDDLE

Title 1, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act:

Background and Prospective Reauthorization Issues

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Wayne Riddle; I am a Specialist in Education Finance with the Congressional Research Service, and I appreciate your invitation to provide background information and a review of prospective reauthorization issues for Title 1, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA.

Basic Provisions of ESEA Title 1, Part A

My remarks will apply only to the programs authorized by Title 1, Part A of the ESEA, not the Even Start, Migrant, Neglected and Delinquent, or Comprehensive

School Reform programs authorized by Parts B through E. ESEA Title 1, Part A, funds are used to provide supplementary educational services to pupils at public schools with relatively high concentrations of children from low-income families, as well as low-achieving pupils who live in the areas served by these public schools, but who attend private schools, Title I has been the "anchor" of the ESEA, and the largest federal elementary-secondary education program, since it was first enacted in 1965. Title I was last reauthorized and substantially revised in 1994, under the Improving America's Schools Act, or IASA. For FY1999, the total funding for Title I, Part A, is $7.7 billion, an amount which has increased by approximately 16 percent since FY1995.

Title I grants or services are provided to approximately: (a) 90 percent of all local educational agencies, or LEAs; (b) 45,000, or 58 percent, of all public schools; and (c) 11 million, or 22 percent of all pupils, including approximately 167,000 pupils attending private schools. Four-fifths of all participating pupils are in pre-kindergarten through grade 6 with only 5 percent of participants in grades 10 through 12.

Title I has numerous requirements regarding such matters as selection of schools and pupils to be served, fiscal accountability, pupil assessment, program improvement, or parental involvement, but few or no requirements regarding such matters as instructional methods, program strategies, or staff qualifications, which are left almost totally to state and LEA discretion. In other words, Title I is now, and always has been, essentially a "funding mechanism", with various forms of encouragement, but no requirements, to employ any specific educational techniques or strategies. In particular, there is no requirement that the instructional methods or strategies used be proven effective through research.

LEAs can generally choose to focus Title I services on selected grade levels—for example, only in elementary schools—but they must generally provide services in general in all schools, whatever their grade level, where the percentage of pupils from low-income families is 75 percent or more. There are 2 basic formats for Title I programs: (1) traditional, or "targeted assistance school," programs and (2) schoolwide programs. In general, only Title I schools in which 50 percent or more of the pupils are from low-income families may operate schoolwide programs, while any school meeting the basic Title I eligibility criteria may operate a targeted assistance program.

CRS-2

In targeted assistance programs, Title I services are focused on the lowest achieving individual pupils in the school. For example, pupils may be "pulled out" of their regular classroom for several hours of more intensive instruction by a specialist teacher each week, or funds may be used to hire a teacher's aide who provides additional assistance to low achieving pupils in their regular classroom. All participating private school pupils are served in targeted assistance programs.

In schoolwide programs, Title I funds may be used to improve the performance of all pupils in a school, and there is no requirement to focus services on only the most disadvantaged pupils. For example, funds might be used to provide professional development services to all of a school's teachers, upgrade instructional technology, reduce class sizes, or implement new curricula.

Currently, most participating schools are targeted assistance schools, but most pupils served by Title I are in schoolwide programs. Finally, although Title I funds are allocated on the basis of children from low-income families, the family income of pupils is not considered at the school level, and there is no means test for individual children to be served by Title 1.

Prospective Title 1, Part A Reauthorization Issues Arising From Implementation of the 1994 Amendments

The overarching questions for reauthorization of Title I are: whether the 1994 amendments under the IASA are being implemented as intended; are they moving the program toward substantially increased effectiveness; and, if the major elements of the IASA's strategy should continue to be pursued, how might they be improved and refined? Alternatively, should strategies other than those embodied in the IASA be adopted to improve federal aid for the education of disadvantaged pupils?

The remainder of my testimony will focus on the major issues debated in the 1994 reauthorization of Title 1, current reauthorization issues arising from the implementation of IASA provisions intended to address these issues, and possible additional issues arising from improvement strategies other than those embodied in the IASA. I should emphasize that given the early stage of the reauthorization process, the issues I identify constitute a preliminary and selective list. Further, since we are still in the middle of implementing some of the most basic provisions of the 1994 amendments, only limited information on the effectiveness of those amendments will be available during this Congress. Thus, most judgments regarding the impact of the 1994 amendments must be considered to be highly tentative.

During the Congress' consideration of the Improving America's Schools Act in 1993-94, there was widespread agreement that the program was not as effective as it should or could be, and the legislation was revised in several major respects. The main reasons identified for this inadequate performance were that the program was usually marginal in terms of both the amount of aid received by high poverty schools relative to their need, and Title I's impact on pupils' overall curriculum; that policies intended to identify effective practices, disseminate information about these, and provide incentives for their adoption were not performing any of these functions well; that performance expectations of Title I pupils were too low; and that the required types of assessments, and program improvement requirements linked to them, were of little value.

Title I amendments embodied in the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 attempted to address each aspect of this critique of Title I. The intended strategy of IASA was to improve Title I's effectiveness through:

First, greater targeting of funds on high poverty LEAs and schools;

Second, requiring states to adopt for Title I students and programs challenging curriculum content standards, pupil performance standards, and assessments, which were to be the same as the standards and assessments applied to all students;

Third, a renewed focus on program improvement requirements, with sanctions for schools and LEAs with inadequate performance, rewards authorized for those with especially good performance, along with expanded technical assistance and related provisions intended to identify effective practices and disseminate information about them; and

Fourth, increased flexibility through expanded schoolwide programs and authority to waive other requirements.

The extent to which these major elements of the 1994 Title I amendments have been implemented varies widely. I will discuss each in turn.

Greater Targeting of Funds on High Poverty LEAs and Schools

The IASA contained a series of provisions that were intended to increase the share of funds going to high-poverty LEAs, more closely link grants to changes in the number of poor children in various regions of the Nation, and increase the targeting of funds on the highest poverty schools within LEAs.

Greater targeting of funds on high poverty LEAs was to be accomplished through use of a new targeted grant formula to allocate a share of post-1994 increases in Title I appropriations. The distinctive feature of this formula, in contrast to other Title I formulas, is that it would provide increased grants per poor child as the percentage or number of poor children in a LEA increases. This was to be combined with a shift to calculating Title I grants by LEA, rather than by county, to better pinpoint high poverty LEAs wherever they may be located. However, while the calculation of grants by LEA is scheduled to occur for the 1999–2000 school year, subsequent appropriations acts have prevented use of the targeted grant formula, as well as a second new allocation formula adopted in 1994 that would reward states with relatively low expenditure disparities among their LEAs.

Better targeting of Title I grants on regions of the Nation with the highest rate of growth in poor school-age children was to be accomplished through use of updated population data made available through a new Census Bureau Program of intercensal population estimates for states, counties, and LEAs, if the data were deemed reliable by the Secretaries of Education and Commerce, as well as a National Academy of Sciences Panel. This provision of the IASA has been implemented, although only partially. The first set of updates for counties had some effect on allocations for fiscal years 1997 and 1998, and a second set of updates, this time for LEAs, is scheduled to be used in allocating fiscal year 1999 grants. However, the impact of population updates on Title I grants has been highly constrained by special provisions in appropriations acts for fiscal years 1997 through 1999, which were adopted in reaction to the unexpected scale and regional shifts in the population updates.

The IASA also contained a number of provisions intended to focus funds more on high poverty schools within LEAs. These provisions have been implemented in most LEAs, and as a result the percentage of high poverty schools receiving Title I grants has increased substantially, while the percentage of low poverty schools participating in the program has declined. However, in a number of LEAs this shift toward higher poverty schools has been constrained through the granting of waivers allowing the continuation of grants to relatively low poverty schools that otherwise would be dropped from eligibility.

Reauthorization issues with respect to targeting include: What level of increased targeting on high poverty LEAs is appropriate and feasible to implement? What is the appropriate balance between the use of the most up?to-date Census data versus stability of grants to lower-growth states and LEAs? And, have the IASA's efforts to increase targeting within LEAs provided sufficient funds to meet the severe needs of schools with very high concentrations of poor pupils?

STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

A second series of IASA provisions requires states participating in Title I to develop or adopt curriculum content standards, pupil performance standards, and assessments linked to these, at least in the subjects of mathematics and reading/language arts. In general, these standards must be applicable to both Title I participants and all other pupils in the state. These provisions address 3 major concerns about Title I programs—that: (a) they had not been sufficiently challenging academically, perpetuating low expectations for the achievement of participating pupils; (b) they had not been well integrated with the "regular" instructional programs of participants; and (c) they had required extensive pupil testing that is of little instructional value and is not linked to pupils' curriculum. These requirements were also adopted in part to link the program to standards-based reforms taking place in most states.

The deadline for adopting content and performance standards was the 1997-98 program year, and for adopting assessments is the 2000-01 program year. States were given time to meet these requirements because many of them were at an early stage of standards-based reform in 1994. Nevertheless, approximately one-half of the states did not meet the fall 1997 deadline for establishing content and pupil performance standards. Currently, 48 states have met the content standards requirement and 21 have met the pupil performance standards requirement; the remaining states have obtained temporary waivers from the Secretary of Education. A few states are finding it difficult to set statewide standards for all pupils, and are attempting to develop hybrid systems that rely ultimately on local standards. States which have not yet adopted assessments linked to their content standards are using a variety of "transitional" assessments, to which only limited requirements apply, to evaluate the performance of pupils being served by Title I.

While the Title I standards requirements are being implemented, the pace at which benchmarks have been met so far is slower than the one specified in the IASA, and it is not yet possible to determine how effective this strategy will be overall in improving the achievement of disadvantaged pupils. The major question for reauthorization is whether to continue supporting the application of standards-based reform concepts to Title I until they are more fully implemented and results are more clear, and whether the schedule for implementation of standards, assessments, and associated accountability provisions can or should be accelerated.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The IASA expanded upon previous Title I program improvement provisions, requiring the identification of schools and LEAs that do not meet state standards for "adequate yearly progress". Ultimately, if performance does not improve, "corrective actions" must be taken, consistent with state and local law, that may include withholding funds, reconstituting school staff, or appointment of a trustee to administer an LEA. However, these "corrective actions" are not to be taken until states adopt assessments linked to their content and performance standards, so these provisions have not yet been fully implemented.

The IASA also included numerous provisions intended to improve and expand the provision of technical assistance on effective practices, especially for schools or LEAs identified as needing improvement. These include the authorization for states to reserve up to 0.5 percent of their Title I funds for program improvement grants, restructuring of regional technical assistance centers, school support teams and "distinguished educators" designated by the states, plus regional laboratories and research and development centers funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. While there are numerous sources for this technical assistance, there is reason for concern about the resources available to technical assistance providers, the effectiveness of their services, and coordination among them. For example, the funding level for the comprehensive technical assistance centers has declined by approximately 40 percent since 1994.

One particular aspect of debates about effective use of Title I funds that is drawing increasing attention is the hiring of teacher aides, who constitute approximately one-half of the staff hired with Title I funds, and are especially prevalent in high poverty LEAs and schools. Aides are used both to provide supplementary instruction and to perform non-instructional tasks. Only a small minority of aides have bachelor's degrees or similar qualifications for instructional duties. The IASA required teacher aides funded under Title I to be directly supervised by teachers, and in general to have a high school diploma or equivalent within 2 years of employment, but many observers have continuing concerns about the effectiveness of using Title I funds to hire aides.

Questions for Title I reauthorization include how to substantially improve the coherence and effectiveness of activities to identify and disseminate information about effective practices, particularly through professional development services for teachers directly involved in instruction; and how to provide meaningful incentives for adoption of effective practices and improved performance while recognizing limits on federal influence and maximizing state and local flexibility in carrying out Title I programs. The potential conflict between the desire to encourage, or even require, the adoption of effective practices in programs such as Title I, and the equally strong desire to maintain and possibly increase the degree of state and local flexibility under these programs, is especially sharp currently. An additional issue is whether the use of Title I funds to hire aides should be limited, or career ladder programs are encouraged so that more of them might be qualified for instructional responsibilities.

FLEXIBILITY

One of the most distinctive changes in Title I since 1994 has been the rapid growth of schoolwide programs. Schoolwide programs may be viewed both as a mechanism to increase Title I's focus on comprehensive schoolwide reform in high poverty schools, and as an example of increased flexibility at the school level. The IASA reduced the low-income pupil eligibility threshold for schoolwide programs from 75 percent to 50 percent in general, and a substantial number of additional schools below the 50 percent threshold have obtained waivers allowing them to adopt schoolwide programs. The IASA also increased the incentive to adopt this Title I format by allowing the use of funds under most federal aid programs, not just Title I, on a schoolwide basis, as long as basic program objectives and fiscal accountability requirements are met. Thus, the Title I schoolwide program statutory provisions authorize a very broad and substantial degree of flexibility to eligible schools in their use of funds under most federal education programs. The rationale for limiting schoolwide program authority to relatively high poverty schools is that in such schools, all pupils are disadvantaged, and the level of Title I grants should be sufficient to meaningfully affect overall school services, since these funds are allocated on the basis of the large number of low?income pupils in these schools.

Schoolwide programs must meet planning requirements that do not apply to other Title I schools, and are to report achievement data for pupils that is disaggregated by gender, race, limited English proficiency status, disability, migrant status, and poverty status, if such disaggregated data can be compiled in a statistically sound manner. Thus far, there is little direct evidence of the achievement effects of this expansion of schoolwide programs.

Finally, both the IASA and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act provided authority for waivers of many Title I statutory or regulatory requirements—case-by case waiver authority exercised directly by the Secretary of Education, and the delegation of waiver authority to SEAs in 12 states under ED-FLEX. A very large proportion of the waiver requests and approvals under both of these authorities have applied to requirements under Title I, especially the 50 percent eligibility threshold for schoolwide programs, certain requirements regarding selection of Title I schools and allocation of funds among them, and the deadline for states to establish curriculum content and pupil performance standards.

Questions for Title I reauthorization regarding flexibility provisions, particularly schoolwide programs, include whether the increased flexibility is being used in ways that are effectively increasing the academic achievement of disadvantaged pupils, whether the accountability requirements are consistent with the increased flexibility in schoolwide programs, and whether there should be any change in the 50 percent low-income pupil percentage that is generally required to qualify for a schoolwide program. And, are there additional forms of flexibility which might be considered, such as a simplification of some administrative requirements for small enrollment LEAs, including charter schools?

Possible Reauthorization Issues That Do Not Arise From Implementation of IASA Provisions

Finally, Congress may consider certain Title I reauthorization issues or strategies that do not arise from implementation of the IASA provisions. Two possibilities are more intensive assistance for very high poverty schools, and an emphasis on school and program choice.

MORE INTENSIVE ASSISTANCE FOR HIGH POVERTY SCHOOLS

Most schools with very high poverty rates undoubtedly continue to face severe and wide-ranging barriers to educational achievement. While some provisions of the IASA have increased the percentage of high poverty schools that receive Title I grants, and raised the amount of those grants to a limited degree, there is continuing interest in providing more intensive financial and technical assistance to these high need schools. Examples include Clinton Administration proposals for Education Opportunity Zones in the 105th Congress, which would have provided additional funds, flexibility, and technical assistance to high poverty schools that adopt selected accountability policies, and the more recent proposal for expansion of the program improvement authority in Title I from 0.5 percent to 2.5 percent of state grants.

SCHOOL CHOICE AND TITLE I

The provisions for use of Title I funds to expand school choice options are currently very limited. While funds are allocated on the basis of numbers of poor children, Title I is currently, and increasingly with the growth of schoolwide programs, structured as a "school aid" program, not an "individual pupil aid" program. A number of proposals were introduced in the last Congress that would allow the use of Title I funds to increase school choice, including private schools, for pupils attending Title I schools that are deemed to be ineffective or unsafe. Others have suggested converting Title I into a "portable grant" that might be used to obtain supplementary services at any public school chosen by a family, or possibly to help the costs of attending private schools or tutorial services as well. Such proposals would require reconsideration of many aspects of Title I as it currently operates, although they might be more compatible with such trends as the increasing number of disadvantaged pupils attending charter schools or other schools of choice in some states.

Thank you; I will be happy to answer any questions you may have regarding my testimony.

References:

Education for the Disadvantaged. Analysis of 1994 ESEA Title I Amendments Under P.L. 103-382. CRS Report 94-968, by Wayne Riddle.

Elementary and Secondary Education: Reconsideration of the Federal Role by the 106th Congress. CRS Issue Brief 98047, by Wayne Riddle, James Stedman, and Paul Irwin.

The Implications of Agostini v. Felton for the Provision of Title I Assistance to Nonpublic School Children. CRS Report 97-848, by Wayne Riddle and David Ackerman.

Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged Perspectives on Studies of Its Achievement Effects. CRS Report 96-82, by Wayne Riddle.

Title I ESFA: Current Status and Issues. CRS Report 96-380, by Wayne Riddle.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baroudi, nice to have you here.

Mr. BAROUDI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We had a little snow fall for you just to make you feel at home.

Mr. BAROUDI. Thank you, sir. Good morning, Senators.

Until recently, Title I served as a catalyst and a driving force in Vermont's school reform agenda. With the passing of our Act 60, our Equal Education Opportunity Act, however, Title I willingly moved over to share major player status with the State itself. That is the way it should be. A Federal-State partnership that brings to schools a common high-standards-for-all message, combined with flexibility and a multitude of resources, benefits not only Vermont students and Vermont communities but ultimately the country at large.

At the time of the last reauthorization, Vermont took advantage of the opportunity to consolidate its State plan for those Federal programs that directly support Improving America's Schools Act. This led to the formation of a Consolidated Federal Programs work team within our State. Having adopted this consolidated, collaborative approach, the team elected to then take the additional step of requiring consolidated Federal applications from each of our 60 LEAs.

Our CFP work group has accepted—indeed, we have embraced the challenge of letting go of categorical approaches so as to work more effectively for improved student performance, and I cannot say strongly enough that the department's entire focus, the Vermont State Department of Education, is around improved student performance.

Because of Vermont's consolidated approach, the positive strides that have taken place in Vermont schools for which Title I has either been the catalyst or otherwise supported have really been achieved in concert with other Federal programs like Title II, Title IV, Title VI, and Goals 2000.

Schoolwide programs. Combining sound and proven pedagogical approaches with high standards and expectations for an entire student body supports one of the lessons learned in earlier versions of Title I. Title I schoolwide programs have the opportunity and the flexibility to set benchmarks toward which other schools can strive. Extended day activities in such settings allow for the supplemental services necessary for students who are at risk or have other special needs.

Certainly schoolwide programs make sense in high-poverty schools, but they also make sense in small schools. One of my colleagues is fond of saying, "You can't have a good Title I program in a bad school." Schoolwide programs, done correctly, ensure that major efforts are taken so that schools improve, as well as all the students within them.

Standards, assessment, and accountability. Vermont has published its "Framework of Standards and Learning Opportunities" which contains vital results, fields of knowledge, and learning opportunities. These standards identify what students should know and be able to do via their school experience. They also identify behaviors and attitudes related to success both in and outside of school. And I think that sort of supports what Senator Dodd said is happening.

Our State-level assessments describe rigorous levels of performance for students to meet or exceed the standard. Work continues on a final system of adequate yearly progress, one that we feel is both rigorous and fair.

These processes and ongoing projects have had strong support from both the Title I work group and the Consolidated Federal Programs work team and cut widely across all educators from across the State. We must stay the course with high standards, assessment, and accountability, for Vermont and, I dare say, many other States are in transition in these areas and we need to finish this critical work.

Early education. Another lesson learned from earlier ESEA programs is that when academic interventions are required, the earlier the intervention is provided, the better. Many Vermont schools use Reading Recovery, a 1st grade reading intervention, with a great deal of success . Critics say that the model itself is expensive, but my counterpart in another New England State indicated to me recently that a study in her State concluded that for every $3 spent on reading recovery, $5 is saved in future remediation costs. Still, intervention at 1st grade is often not early enough. Many of our kindergartners come to school delayed, especially in the area of language. A Title I-sponsored preschool program in Franklin County has shown great results in working with disadvantaged pre-K students and their families, so that when these students enter kindergarten, they are both prepared and ready to participate fully in appropriate kindergarten activities. These educators have set standards for their students that are linked to the Vermont framework, standards that exceed those required by Head Start. I find more and more Vermont LEAs have begun to explore a district-wide approach to early childhood education using Title I dollars, and personally I believe it is important that we focus on early child education and continue this work.

Small State issues. Capacity issues plague us all, for we have accepted an enormous challenge, one, undertaking to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to achieve at high levels. In small States, however, the capacity issues are exacerbated. Let me share with you what small means from our perspective.

Vermont is the most sparsely populated State in the Nation. It is also the most inclusive. Our population of 550,000 to 600,000 people is spread thinly throughout the Green Mountains. Our largest and some say only city contains a population of only 45,000. The next largest cluster of Vermonters totals only about 20,000. Therefore, in a department such as the one in which I work, we have 120 staff members, and there is a staff pattern where we are only one deep. There is no redundancy.

The work that is required of our State and expected of our State is the same that is required and expected of larger States. It is just that our numbers are smaller.

Size and capacity issues are mirrored in our schools. Our average elementary school contains about 250 students. One-fifth of our schools have a population of less than 100 students. Sixty-five percent of our districts have only one school. Our largest district has only 20 schools. In many cases, secretarial support is lacking, and it is the principal who you will find answering the phone.

Vermont has benefited from and continues to benefit from Title I small State minimums. Such minimums in administration and school improvement have helped tremendously, and they allow small States like Vermont to approach the SEA responsibilities outlined in the legislation without feeling completely overwhelmed. Still, it is often a stretch. As we collectively set high standards, finalize our new accountability systems, and begin to gauge schools' progress using new assessments, new curricula, and updated teaching methods, it is possible that the number of schools who are identified for school improvement may rise dramatically. Certainly, as

Mr. Riddle pointed out, the numbers of schoolwides continue to rise.

The small State minimum at its current level could not cover the cost of a meaningful statewide system of support if even only 5 percent of Title I schools in our State were to need significant assistance.

My colleagues and I appreciate the tremendous support of Senator Jeffords and this committee over the past several months. As one of the original ed-flex States, Vermont was gratified to see steps taken last week to share similar responsibilities with all States.

Thank you. I thank you, too, for offering me the opportunity to add a small, rural State's perspective to these proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for your statement, and I am going to spend a lot of time with you there in the next few weeks and months.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Baroudi follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID BAROUDI

Until recently, Title I served as a catalyst and driving force in Vermont's School Reform agenda. With the passing of Act 60, our Equal Education Opportunity Act, however, Title I willingly moved over to share "major player" status with the State itself. To my way of thinking, that is the way it should be. A Federal-State partnership that brings a common message, flexibility, and a multitude of resources to schools, benefits not only Vermont children and Vermont communities, but ultimately the country at large.

At the time of the last reauthorization of Title I , Vermont took advantage of the opportunity to consolidate its State Plan for Federal programs that directly support Improving America's Schools Act (IASA). This led to the formation of a Consolidated Federal Programs Work Team within our State. Having begun to model this consolidated, collaborative approach, we took the additional step of requiring Consolidated Federal Program applications from each of our 60 LEAs.

Like our State, our SEA work group is small. Nevertheless, we have accepted, indeed embraced, the challenge of letting go of categorical approaches so as to work more effectively for improved student performance. I know we have made a great deal of progress. Still, the journey is long and arduous and in many ways we have just begun.

I would like to briefly share with you this morning some of our successes, and within those successes, some challenges. Please keep in mind that the Vermont approach is a consolidated one and what positive strides that have been taken in Vermont schools for which Title I has been the catalyst or otherwise has been able to support, have really been achieved in concert with Title I's sister Titles: Title II, Title IV, and Title VI.

SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS—Combining sound, proven pedagogical approaches with high standards and expectations for an entire student body supports one of the lessons learned in earlier versions of Title I. Title I Schoolwide programs have the opportunity and flexibility to set benchmarks toward which other schools can strive. Extended day activities in such settings allow for the supplemental services necessary for students who are at-risk or have other special needs. One such Vermont school, Molly Stark School in Bennington, under the dynamic leadership of their Principal Sue Maguire has become a Yale School of the 21st Century and is in line next year to, with the aid of a community block grant, build a family resource center adjacent to the school building itself. Molly Stark is also a recent recipient of mentoring grant and a Vermont Council on the Humanities grant to promote family literacy. Certainly Schoolwide Programs make sense in high poverty schools, but also in small schools. One of my colleagues is fond of saying "You can't have a good Title I program in a bad school." Schoolwide programs, done correctly, ensure that major efforts are taken to ensure schools improve, as well as all of the students within those schools. Still, a challenge we face at the SEA is that while there is a disconnect between us and those schools who opt to become schoolwides. Schoolwide plans are not required to be approved by the SEA, reacted to by the SEA, or even shared with the SEA.

STANDARDS, ASSESSMENT, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Vermont has published its Framework of Standards and Learning Opportunities which contains vital results, fields of knowledge, and learning opportunities. These content standards identify what students should know and be able to do via their school experience as well as identify behaviors and attitudes related to success both in and outside of school. Performance standards are attached to our state-level assessments. In 1998 state-level assessments based on our standards were administered in Reading, English Language Arts, Math and Science. Likewise, we have developed, piloted and administered a Developmental Reading Assessment which was given at grade two. This instrument continues to evolve as we work to ensure all Vermont students are able to read independently by the end of third grade. Work continues on a state-level assessment in social studies and toward adopting a final system of adequate yearly progress that is both rigorous and fair. These processes and ongoing projects have had strong support from our Consolidated Federal Programs Team and a wide cross section of educators from across the State. We must stay the course with high Standards, Assessment and Accountability. Vermont, and I dare say many other states, are in transition here and we need to finish this critical work.

EARLY EDUCATION

Another lesson learned from earlier ESEA programs is that when academic interventions are required, the earlier the intervention is provided the better. Vermont uses Reading Recovery, a first grade reading intervention, with a great deal of success. Although critic say that the model itself is expensive, my counterpart in another New England state indicated to me recently that a study in her state concluded that for every three dollars spent on reading recovery, they save five dollars in future remediation costs. Still, first grade is often not early enough. Vermont spends upwards to 50 percent of its Title I dollars in grades pre-kindergarten to third grade. Many of our kindergartners come to school delayed, especially in the area of language. A Title I sponsored preschool program in Franklin County has shown great results in working with pre-k students and their families to have these students prepared and ready to participate fully in reasonable kindergarten activities. These folks in Franklin County have set standards for their students that exceed those found in Head Start. I find more Vermont LEAs have explored a districtwide approach to early childhood education using Title I dollars as allowed under the IASA. It is important that this focus on early childhood education continue.

SMALL STATE ISSUES

Capacity issues plague small states. Vermont benefits from the Title I "Small State Minimums." "Small State Minimums" in both administration and school improvement help tremendously; nevertheless, I think it is prudent to revisit what is required of SEAs under the current legislation. For example, the Statewide System of Support currently required under Title I must be available to all high poverty schools (schools with poverty in excess of 75%); schools running Title I Schoolwide Programs; schools that have been identified for School Improvement; and also, as needed and appropriate, other Title I schools. As we collectively set high standards, finalize our new accountability systems, and begin to gauge schools' progress using new curricula and teaching methods, it is possible that the number of schools who are identified for School Improvement may rise dramatically. The small state minimum at its current level for school improvement would not begin to cover meaningful support to even five percent of Title I schools in our State.

My colleagues and I appreciate the tremendous support of Senator Jeffords and this Committee over the past several months. As one of the original ED FLEX states, Vermont was gratified to see similar responsibilities shifted to all states. Thank you. Thank you too for offering me the opportunity to share a small, rural State's perspective to these proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Ford.

Ms. FORD. Good morning. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address the members of this committee regarding the many positive ways that Title I works in a large urban area and, more specifically, how Title I is succeeding in the Chicago public schools.

To illustrate the size of the Title I project in Chicago, you should know that approximately 270,000 students and 2,800 staff members participate in Title I activities in 480 public schools, 100 nonpublic sites, and 24 child-parent centers. They are funded by a grant of approximately $169 million.

At-risk students and their teachers have greatly benefited under Title I, and they continue to benefit under the numerous initiatives implemented by the Chicago public schools under the 1994 ESEA reauthorization legislation. The new law mandated a shift in decisionmaking from the central administration to the local school level. In addition, this new law allowed more flexibility in determining the geographical location of school attendance areas with low-income students.

The 50 percent schoolwide eligibility program was a nonwaivable provision that has helped our schoolwide programs to increase the 57 programs in 1995 to 243 programs in 1999.

Some of the reform initiatives include the expansion of activities in the areas of professional development, extended-day programs, schoolwide projects, and summer bridge.

Special note to professional development. As research tells us, professional development should be on-site and in the classroom. We have what is known as the Chicago Teachers Academy for Professional Development for 30,000 teachers of which over 50 percent service eligible Title I students. Presently, our academy focuses on the alignment of the Chicago public school standards and the Illinois State standards with site-based needs.

We have found that colleges and universities oftentimes give our teachers only one course in reading, and that is methods of reading. So we went to look at what research said, and research said that our teachers needed diagnosis of reading and reading in the content area. That is a model that we are developing in the Chicago public schools. We are going to incrementally mandate that all of our teachers get those two additional courses, and that is reading in the content area for our primary teachers and reading—I am sorry, reading diagnosis in the primary grades, and reading in the content area for our high school teachers. We looked at those districts where teachers were getting more bang for their buck. By that, I mean their attendance scores were soaring, and we wanted to follow that model as best practices.

Also, our Reading Enhancement Action Plan, we also looked at those schools that were above probation. We send six reading specialists into those 91 schools, and whereas they would give on-site reading instruction and they would go into the classrooms and actually model best practices in those areas. We also are getting additional help from our colleges and universities. This is a collaborative effort.

Our High School Initiative also includes the expansion of the cadre of Title I teachers with the use of reading strategies that focus on best practices techniques.

Senator Dodd is not here to hear this, but we have what is known as a Teacher Induction Mentoring Program. According to research, large urban areas lose 50 percent of their new teachers in the first 5 years. We wanted to make sure that we would retain our new teachers, so we offer a mentoring program to each one of those new teachers. We recruit them and retain good teachers and improve student learning through these exemplary teaching strategies that we offer these new teachers.

We also have the Read Write Well program, and this program is to make writing an integral part of reading activities. We have ambitiously made plans to offer additional professional development to some 10,000 Chicago teachers who serve Title I students.

We know that the key to teaching low-income children how to read effectively is a set of distinctive practices that includes a staff development program of informed and knowledgeable teachers. An emphasis on high standards and high expectations for all students has also led to the development of curriculum benchmarks, which indicate required student achievement for each grade level.

Title I teachers and regular classroom teachers now work together to align the local school curriculum and instruction practices with these benchmarks and with the assessments. The result is optimum learning opportunities for all students.

We have also introduced a number of early intervention strategies that target students in grades K through 2. Through our Cradle-to-Classroom Program and other early childhood programs, we hope to detect those students who are not achieving at an early grade level and thus decrease the students in later grades who experience learning deficits. Through Title I funds, we are able to serve younger at-risk children who would otherwise not receive educational services.

The intensifying of parental involvement has resulted in expanded parent-school-community linkages and the development of partnerships that influence every child's learning process. We have embraced the concept of parental involvement. Our Title I Parent Resource Center continues to extend parental involvement activities through parent advisory councils at the citywide, region, and local school levels.

Extended-day programs. After-school and tutorial programs provide increased instructional time, a variety of instructional activities, and added support for Title I students. Innovative programs that emphasize peer tutoring and adult tutoring are often included in the after-school activities.

I think, Senator Jeffords, you visited the school where I was a principal at the Beethoven Elementary School. I serviced in the infamous Robert Taylor Holmes. I serviced six buildings from Robert Taylor. And when Mr. Valez and the Reform Board came aboard, they looked at the model that I had used at Beethoven, and it was the extended-day model. When I looked at the fact that my students were not getting the actual 300 minutes, I polled my teachers and asked them who could stay one hour after school. Only three had to leave, but I hand ancillary staff who could go into the school. We added an additional hour of reading to that day, and that is when my scores doubled.

Now, when I went to the school, the school was number 5 from the bottom of 476 elementary schools. Now that school is in the middle. So it can be done. And when you asked me to be the probation manager, you wanted me to be the probation manager because it had happened in an area that was plagued with poverty and drugs.

Schoolwide projects, as previously mentioned, offer us the flexibility provided through reauthorization to expand our schoolwide projects. Also, in our elementary schools, we have character education. I would like to say also that that has been a big plus in most of our elementary schools, because oftentimes children might not know some things. When you offer them all of the kinds of character traits that we offer in our elementary schools, it is certainly a plus.

I would just like to—and I am ending this. In conclusion, it should also be noted that the restructuring of "watch list" schools was also done with the help of Title I schools. When the Reform Board came aboard, we had 127 schools who were on the academic "watch list." To date, we only have 58, and hopefully in May they would end.

We also offer summer bridge. This is an intense summer school program for students, especially in the areas of reading and mathematics. The Summer Bridge Program has been particularly critical in helping many 8th grade students meet the criteria for promotion to high school. This has been a program that has given us this reform model that the Nation would begin to use for those students who do not meet the criteria that we set for them earlier.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Ford follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LULA M. FORD

Good Morning: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address the members of this committee regarding the many positive ways that Title I works in a large urban area, and more specifically, how Title 1, is succeeding in the Chicago Public Schools (CPS).

The Title I program began when the first attempt at space travel came through the Russian spaceship called Sputnik. The United States in its efforts to keep up with the race for space knew that education was the answer. Additional support for underachieving children from low-income families was implemented through the supplementary federal Chapter I program.

Chicago has since responded to this call. Dr. Mae Jemison was not only the first Black female astronaut, she was also a product of the Chicago Public Schools. She attended the Dumas and Esmond schools and graduated from Morgan Park High School. These schools received support from Title I Programs.

Chicago's Title I programs have gown since then. To illustrate the size of the Title I project in Chicago, you should know that approximately 270,000 students and 2,800 staff members participate in Title I activities in 480 public schools, 100 non-public sites, and 24 child-parent centers. They are funded by a grant of approximately $169 million.

At-risk students and their teachers have greatly benefited under Title 1, and they continue to benefit under the numerous initiatives implemented by the Chicago Public Schools under the 1994 ESEA reauthorization legislation. The new law mandated a shift in decision making, from the central administration to the local school level. In addition, this new law allowed more flexibility in determining the geographical location of school attendance areas with low-income students.

The 50 percent schoolwide program eligibility was a non-waivable provision that has helped our schoolwide programs to increase from 57 programs in 1995, when the program first began, to 243 programs in 1999.

The 1994 Reauthorization has allowed us to provide a more equitable process in the distribution of Title I funds that actually includes funds for more schools, participation for a larger number of at-risk students and an improved delivery of services to Title I schools and their students. However, during these times of reform when President Clinton has called for Chicago to be a role model for the nation, we need the continued support of Title I for many reform initiatives that have been implemented over the last few years.

Some of those reform initiatives include the expansion of activities in the areas of 1.) Professional Development; 2.) Extended-Day Programs; 3.) Schoolwide Projects; and 4.) Summer Bridge Programs.

1.) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Chicago Public Schools Teachers Academy for Professional Development provides staff development for the system's 30,000 teachers of which over 50% service eligible Title I students.

Presently, the Academy has focused on professional development that directly aligns CPS standards and Illinois State Goals with site-based need. Many programs foster the growth of innovative, high-quality learning environments.

Our Reading Enhancement Action Plan calls for: An increase in the number of reading specialists, who will provide site-based modeling and peer-coaching in effective reading strategies for 91 targeted Title I schools (approximately 3,900 classrooms); and collaborations with universities to provide instruction in reading for classroom teachers.

2.) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Chicago Public Schools Teachers Academy for Professional Development provides staff development for the system's 30,000 teachers of which over 50% service eligible Title I students. Presently, the Academy has focused on professional development that directly aligns CPS standards and Illinois State Goals with site-based need. Many programs foster the growth of innovative, high-quality learning environments.

Our Reading Enhancement Action Plan calls for: An increase in the number of reading specialists, who will provide site-based modeling and peer-coaching in effective reading strategies for 91 targeted Title I schools (approximately 3,900 classrooms); and collaborations with universities to provide instruction in reading for classroom teachers.

Our High School Reading Initiative also includes the expansion of the cadre of Title I teachers with the use of reading strategies that focus on Best Practices techniques. The Reading Assessment Inventory for Schools (RAIS) is presently being developed as an evaluation instrument to assist in this process. Each school uses the RAIS instrument in order to assess its strengths and weaknesses as they relate to Best Practices.

The goal of the Teacher Induction Mentoring (TIM) Program is to improve student learning for Title I students through recruiting and retaining good teachers and improving student learning through exemplary teaching practices.

The purpose of our Read Write Well Program is to make writing an integral part of reading activities. We have ambitiously made plans to offer additional professional development to some 10,000 Chicago teachers who service Title I students.

Key to teaching low-income children how to read effectively is a set of distinctive practices that includes a staff development program of informed and knowledgeable teachers. For example, Earhart School serves an 85 percent low-income and 99 percent African American student body on Chicago's south side. Earhart students have risen from 33 percent at or above the national norm on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in reading in 1990 to 75 percent in 1997 which at that time bested many suburban schools. Research analyses identified a set of distinctive practices used by teaching staff that helped to significantly raise Earhart's reading achievement levels. An emphasis on high standards and expectations for all students has also led to the development of curriculum benchmarks, which indicate required student achievement for each grade level.

Corresponding new assessment techniques have also been developed. Title I teachers and regular classroom teachers now work together to align the local school curriculum and instruction practices with these benchmarks and with the assessments. The result is optimum learning opportunities for all students. We have also introduced a number of early intervention strategies that target students in grades K–2. Through our Cradle-to-Classroom Program and other early childhood programs we hope to detect those students who are not achieving at an early grade level and thus decrease the students in later grades who experience learning deficits. Through Title I funds, we are able to serve younger at-risk children who would otherwise not receive educational services. These services include early identification and screening activities, as well as programs that expand community awareness through parental involvement.

The intensifying of parental involvement has resulted in expanded parent school-community linkages and the development of partnerships that influence every child's learning process. We have embraced the concept of parental involvement.

Our Title I Parent Resource Center continues to extend parental involvement activities through parent advisory councils at the citywide, region and local school levels.

3.) Extended-Day Programs after-school and tutorial programs provide increased instructional time, a variety of instructional activities and added support for Title I students. Innovative programs that emphasize peer tutoring and adult tutoring are often included in the after-school activities. Beethoven School is another example of 98 percent low-income students with a 100 percent African American student population. The Beethoven Language Arts Program begins with 90 minutes in the morning and continues as an integral part of the school program with a two-hour extended-day after school program.

In the past years reading scores have gone up 14% and mathematics up to 20 percent.

4.) Schoolwide Projects As previously mentioned, the flexibility provided through reauthorization has enabled us to expand our Schoolwide Projects. One of our CPS reform initiatives involved the redesigning of the format for a new school improvement plan. This plan, which is now known as the School Improvement Plan for Advancing Academic Achievement (SIPAAA), was redesigned to help schools see the global relationship between allocations, budgets and the implementation of programs that focused on prioritized needs. The new SIPAAA has helped schools to focus on the expenditure of Title I funds as they relate to other categorical programs and student achievement. The SIPAAA has been the basis for a comprehensive plan for the more efficient use of federal funds.

Paperwork and reports that had formerly been required, have been eliminated. The reduced emphasis on financial monitoring has allowed the CPS to reorganize management of the Title I project and expand support services to local schools while requiring greater accountability at the local school level.

The Schoolwide Project is based on this same concept and its expansion has provided Title I children with an environment that is inclusive, rather than one that is fragmented and fraught with negative implications. The inclusive environment provided by Schoolwide Projects supports the teaming efforts of staff, provides Title I students with realistic models of achievement and increases opportunities for learning.

5.) Summer Bridge The Summer Bridge Program has been the basis of another reform initiative to end social promotion and ensure that students are equipped with the necessary learning skills before advancing to another grade.

The Summer Bridge provides intensive summer school for students especially in the areas of reading and mathematics. The Summer Bridge program has been particularly critical in helping many eighth grade students meet the criteria for promotion to high school.

In conclusion, it should also be noted that the restructuring of "watch list" schools was also done with the help of Title I funds. Local schools received assistance in changing the curriculum, training staff, and engaging external support partners. This enabled the number of "watch list" schools to decrease from 127 in 1995 to 58 in 1998.

As a CPS educator, I can say with certainty that we do have a plan. There was a plan before Dr. Jemison took off into outer space. And there are still actions and goals that revolve around that plan. We believe that Title I will continue to be an integral part of that plan as we continue to launch strategies and initiatives that will improve the academic achievement of our Title I students.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Collins. I welcome the opportunity to be here this morning to summarize some of the chief findings of the Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights report, "Title I in Midstream: The Fight to Improve Schools for Poor Kids," and if I may, I would like to have the executive summary of the report included along with my testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be made part of the record of these hearings.

Mr. TAYLOR. I also work closely with the Title I Reform Network, which, as you may know, was a group that advocated very strongly for the reforms that Congress adopted in 1994, when I think you did a historic thing: You began the work of converting what has been a two-tier system with the notion—which has been premised on the notion that only poor—that poor kids could only master basic skills, to a single system where the expectation is that all children will learn and learn at high levels. That is an absolutely critical precept on which you have been operating.

I also am Vice Chair of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which has made Title I reauthorization a top priority for the first time this time around.

Now, for purposes of the committee's review, perhaps the most important finding of the commission's report is that there is strong evidence that the standards-based reforms adopted by Congress in 1994 and by some States at an even earlier date are producing positive results and that they can be made to work—not just for a handful of schools with dynamic principals, but for whole groups of schools and for whole school districts.

In several places, notably Maryland, Texas, Kentucky—Vermont I would include in that group—major elements of reform have been put into place on a statewide basis. And it is interesting to note, as Senator Dodd did, that some of the States that have taken the lead on standards-based reform—Kentucky, Maryland, and Connecticut among them—also show significant gains on the recently issued NAEP scores for the 4th grade.

Several urban districts have also launched reforms. As part of the statewide effort in Texas that have brought gains in El Paso as well as other districts, in San Antonio 35 schools have raised themselves out of the category of low-performing over the past 5 years. And it is notable that Latino and African American students have improved at a faster rate than whites, thus narrowing the achievement gap. Similar progress has been made in Memphis where the school system is using proven programs like the successful Roots and Wings in the early grades. And Philadelphia has also made important gains.

Now, the commission devotes a large part of its report to the failures in implementation, and we do believe that even more progress would have been made if States and the Federal Government had vigorously implemented the policies in Title I. And I would be glad to go into that later if the committee so desires.

One point I would make is that maintaining the Federal role, which is a limited but an absolutely critical role in assuring equal opportunity, is something that really needs to be done. Somehow the notion has gotten around that the Federal Government does not have any role except passing the money along to the States and localities. The fact is that we would not have made the progress that we have if the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment had not been enforced if we did not have the civil rights acts, if we did not attack racial segregation in the schools, and if there had not been care taken to assure that Title I money, when it came along, was not wasted but was targeted to the kids who need it most.

And that is not just history we are talking about. I think today these needs continue to exist. There are huge concentrations of poverty in some of our big cities. The people who live in those concentrations are almost all African Americans and Latinos, and all the research tells us that those concentrated poverty schools are the least favorable environment for children to learn. So the Federal Government has to continue to police the civil rights laws, and it has to continue to look at these resource inequalities which are tremendous in teaching and in other areas as well. And if we do not maintain that role, I think we are in real trouble.

Now, as to the commission's recommendations, first, we recommend that Congress ratify the principles of standards-based reform contained in the 1994 amendments. They have been in effect for a relatively short period of time. Many schools have just begun to implement school improvements. We have not gotten to the accountability stage, not even to final assessments. This was intended as a program that could only work if given time, and it needs to be given time.

Second, Congress needs to take additional steps to increase the capacity of schools and school districts in areas of concentrated poverty to meet the goals of reform. The single most important effort should be to improve the quality of teaching in these areas. Under the 1994 amendments, States have the responsibility of assisting local districts and schools to achieve the capacity to meet their obligations to improve student performance. These obligations under sections 1114 and 1115 include the duty to have high-quality professional staff. And so Congress should call upon the States and provide Federal assistance to devise programs of rewards and incentives to retain high-quality teachers and to attract the ablest young people into teaching. Efforts ought to be made also to facilitate mid-career transfers of people who have something to give to the public schools, and we need to be very creative, I think, in this area.

The goal should be to assure that within a few years all students in high-poverty schools have qualified teachers who are teaching in the areas in which they are certified. And teachers now in the workforce, as my other colleagues on the panel have emphasized, ought to given enhanced opportunities for professional development. I think Congress ought to look at designating a larger part of Title I funds than you have up to now for professional development.

Third, Congress should strengthen the accountability features of the law. In particular, States should be required to provide meaningful remedies for children who are trapped in failing schools and school systems if they simply do not response to improvement measures. Where schools fail, they ought to be reconstituted with new leaders. Students in those persistently failing schools ought to have the option to transfer to schools that are providing effective education.

Finally, I would say that if Congress meant what it said—and I am sure it did—in saying that all children can learn, it must make sure that nobody is left out of the reform effort. That means that children who are English language learners or who have disabilities must be included in Title I programs, and they must be accommodated on assessments in ways that permit them to demonstrate what they know and can do. They must not excluded or exempted or encouraged not to participate, as has happened so often in the past.

School districts should not be given a pass for general improvements in scores if students in poverty and those with limited English proficiency have not made progress. This means that accountability for high standards and for a curriculum that provides students the opportunity to reach them comes first. High stakes should not be visited on students until the school system itself is held accountable for providing them with genuine opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, you began with a Jefferson quote, and I have got a favorite one of my own, which is that—I think it may have been the same year that your quote came from. He said that the object of public education was to uncover the massive talents that lay buried in every county for want of means of development. And I think you are about the work here of providing the means of development, and anything we all can do to support you in that work we want to do.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We certainly agree with you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Taylor follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM L. TAYLOR

Chairman Jeffords and members of the Committee: My name is William Taylor and I serve as Vice Chair of the Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, a bipartisan group consisting of former federal officials and other citizen leaders, which monitors the policies of the federal government and seeks to advance equality of opportunity for all persons.

About two years ago, the Commission decided that there was no issue more important to the welfare,of the nation and its children than the effort to achieve comprehensive school reform as manifested in the amendments to Title 1, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act adopted by the Congress in 1994. With help from several foundations, the Commission, whose members include Augustus Hawkins, Ray Marshall Elliot Richardson and others with extensive experience in education, undertook a study of how the Title I reforms were being implemented. The first phase of the study, an examination of the record of the Department of Education in implementing the 1994 law, has been completed and an executive summary of the report was published in the Fall of 1998 and has been made available to the Committee. The full report, Title I in Midstream: The Fight to Improve Schools for Poor Kids, will be issued shortly.

The second phase of the study-an examination of Title I reform in four states-is underway. We appreciate the invitation to share our findings with the Committee today. As the Committee well knows, the 1994 reforms were predicated on a central finding that Congress made in the legislation: that all children, including disadvantaged children, can succeed when expectations for them are high and when they are given the opportunity to master challenging material. It followed from this finding that the two-tier system countenanced under Title I under which poor children were expected to master only basic skills had to be replaced by a system in which all children are expected to achieve high standards and are given the opportunity to do so.

THE GOOD NEWS ON TITLE I

For purposes of the Committee's review, perhaps the most important finding of the Commission's report is that there is strong evidence that the standards-based reforms adopted by Congress in 1994, and by some states at an even earlier date, are producing positive results and that they can be made to work-not just for a handful of schools with dynamic principals, but for groups of schools and whole school districts. (Executive Summary, pp. 23-25).

In several states, notably Maryland, Texas and Kentucky, major elements of reform have been put in place on a statewide basis. Several urban school districts have also launched reforms.

As part of the statewide effort in Texas that has brought gains in El Paso as well as other districts, 35 schools in San Antonio have raised themselves out of the category of "low preforming" over the past five years. It is notable that African-American and Latino students have improved at a faster rate than whites, thus narrowing the achievement gap. Similar progress has been made in Memphis where the school system is using proven reading programs like Roots and Wings in the early grades.

Philadelphia has also made important gains. Data released last August shows a 12 to 15 point gain on the Stanford-9 exam at the fourth grade level in children scoring at the basic level or higher in math, reading and science. Philadelphia also has a tough accountability system in which schools are strongly discouraged from excusing students from taking tests because of lack of English proficiency or because of a disability. This is in accord with Title I provisions that require that LEP students and students with disabilities be accommodated, not excused from taking tests. (Unfortunately, not all districts are following the law and where students are excused from taking tests, the school system remains unaccountable for their progress). In Philadelphia, the school receives a zero for each untested child. As a result, 87 percent of students took the test in 1998 compared to 72 percent in 1996.

FEDERAL AND STATE FAILURES TO IMPLEMENT REFORM

The Commission believes that even more progress would have been made if states and the federal government had faithfully and vigorously implemented the precepts and policies contained in Title I—that schools and school systems should be characterized by high standards and expectations, by attention to improved teaching, by accurate assessments of student achievement and.by accountability for student progress.

Soon after the 1994 reforms were enacted, the Department of Education took a step that undermined the fundamental objectives of the law. Contrary to the statutory requirement that states adopt uniform standards, the Department said it would be acceptable for states to adopt standards that were simply a patchwork' of local standards without any effective means of assuring that all students will be called upon to meet high standards. The plan, initially submitted by the state of California, permitted each of the state's 1,052 school districts to develop and use its.own standards with adoption of state standards left voluntary.

Under this approach, the state says it is acceptable for a poor district like Los Angeles or East Palo Alto to have one set of standards and for Beverly Hills or Berkeley to have another. Never mind that under Proposition 209, when and if they get to apply for college, the children of Los Angeles and East Palo Alto will have to meet the same standards as the students of Beverly Hills and Berkeley. Under the Department's interpretation, the two-tier system of black and Latino students and white students, of economically disadvantaged and middle class students, is alive and well-though going under a different name.

In addition, the Department of Education, among other things, has failed:

- to insist on timely adoption by states of performance standards for gauging proficiency, with the result that many states have failed to adopt such standards;
- to explicate the statutory requirement that children be assessed in the language most likely to yield accurate information about their knowledge and skills, with the result that many English language learners are either exempted from tests or tested in a language they have not yet learned;
- to require states to measure separately the annual programs of poor children and English language learners and to take other steps to assure accountability for these children's progress;
- to place sufficient emphasis on the importance of improving teaching through thoughtful programs of professional development.

In these, and several other important areas, progress has been stymied by the failure of federal officials to provide clear guidance consistent with the law and to insist on timely and appropriate implementation by states and local school districts. If accountability was the byword of the 1994 reforms, the Department of Education must also be held accountable.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN ASSURING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Why has the Department been so timid and lethargic in implementing the 1994 reforms? One major reason is that a system of belief has taken hold both in the Congress and the Executive branch that public education is a matter to be entrusted almost entirely to state and local authorities and that the federal government has virtually no appropriate role other than providing financial assistance.

Such assertions neglect more than a century of experience with state endorsed segregation and deprivation in public education. They also disregard current reality. While the federal role in education is limited, it is critical. The Fourteenth Amendment calls upon the Federal government to assure equality of opportunity in public education. The constitutional provisions calling for a strong national defense and for steps to promote the general welfare establish a national interest in a strong educational system.

Over the past three decades, black and Latino children have made major progress in closing the gap in academic performance between themselves and white children. That would not have happened without strong federal action to end state-enforced segregation. That Would not have happened without insistence by federal officials that the assistance provided through Head Start and Title I be directed to students with the greatest needs and not siphoned off to other uses.

This is not ancient history. Although progress has been made, in 1999, state policies still permit the maintenance of schools with large concentrations of students who live in poverty, almost all of whom are black or Latino. This is despite the knowledge that such concentrated poverty provides the worst environment for learning. While progress has been made in some states in equalizing resources, almost everywhere the children in these high poverty schools are shortchanged on resources-on teachers, counselors, books, computers-that are routinely provided in wealthier areas.

So, to say that the federal role is minimal and that these matters can be left to the Governors and other state officials is to consign poor children and particularly poor children of color to a continuation of separate and unequal education. That is why the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and many education reform groups are concerned about the expansion of Ed Flex without guarantees of equity and accountability for school reform. That is why in the reauthorization of Title I Congress should be particularly attentive to the needs of the poorest students for fair and equal treatment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on its study, the Commission made several recommendations geared to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

First, we recommend that Congress ratify the principles of standards-based reform contacted in the 1994 amendments. These amendments have been in effect for a relatively short period of time. Many schools have just begun to implement whole school improvements and others are still waiting for needed technical assistance. Indeed, only now are we reaching the critical stages of final assessments and accountability measures. The evidence so far is encouraging. So there is every reason to continue the investment in reform.

Second, Congress should take additional steps to improve the capacity of schools and school districts in areas of concentrated poverty to meet the goals of reform. The single most important effort should be to improve the quality of teaching in these areas. Under the 1994 amendments, States have the responsibility of assisting local districts and schools to achieve the capacity to meet their obligations for improving student performance. These obligations under sections 1114 and 1115 include the duty to have high-quality professional staff. Congress should call upon the states with some Federal assistance to devise programs of rewards and incentives to retain high-quality teachers and to attract the ablest young people into teaching. Also, efforts should be made to facilitate mid-career transfers of business people (like the program now in effect for military people) into teaching, particularly those with needed skills in science and technology.

The goal should be to assure that within a few years all students in high -poverty schools will have qualified teachers who are teaching in the areas in which they are certified. Similarly, the skills of teachers now in the work force should be improved through enhanced opportunities for professional development. Congress should consider amending the law to assure that all schools, not just those identified as needing improvement spend a specified proportion of their grants on professional development.

Third, Congress should strengthen the accountability features of the law. In particular, States should be required to provide meaningful remedies for children who are trapped in failing schools or school systems. Where schools persistently fail, they should be reconstituted with new leaders who will change the old ways. And students in these persistently failing schools should have the option of transferring to schools or districts that offer effective education.

Finally, if Congress meant what it said in finding that all children can learn, it must make sure that no one is left out of the reform effort. This means that children who are English language learners or who have disabilities must be included in Title I programs and accommodated on assessments in ways that permit them to demonstrate what they know and can do. They must not be excluded or encouraged not to participate as has happened so often in the past. Schools and school districts should not be given a pass for general improvements in scores if students in poverty and those with limited English proficiency have not made progress. It means that accountability for high standards and for a curriculum that provides students the opportunity to reach them comes first. High stakes should not be visited on students until school systems are held accountable for providing them with genuine opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we as a Nation have a great opportunity over the next two years to help children learn and succeed. Every public opinion survey tells us that the American people put public education at the top of their list of needs and that they are ready to invest their tax dollars in meeting the need. But there is a real danger that we may fritter away this opportunity in rhetoric and political gamesmanship.

This Committee has the expertise and experience to avoid these pitfalls. We all know that "states rights" and "local control" can become catchwords that are used to excuse neglect of students with the greatest needs. We know that if a student reaches the fourth grade without the ability to read well, neither making that student repeat the grade nor allowing him to move ahead is a good option. Instead of campaigning against "social promotion," we know that the answers lie in early childhood education, in research-tested learning strategies in the early grades and, if necessary, in extended school days, summer school and intensive remediation so that students can make up lost ground quickly. We know that reducing class size will do little good unless we can increase the supply of capable teachers. And unless the Congress targets class size reductions to the poorest schools, the danger is that reducing class size may draw able teachers out of inner city schools into the suburbs making things worse for poor children.

With that experience and knowledge, this Committee and the Congress are in a position to have a major impact on the future course of American public education. In fact, it is possible that what you do for the future opportunities of children may be the most important votes you cast in this Congress, and perhaps in your careers in public service.

[Due to the high cost of printing, the booklet entitled "Title I in Midstream: The Fight To Improve Schools For Poor Kids," can be obtained from the Citizens Commission on Civil Rights.]

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Bergeson.

Ms. BERGESON. Thank you very much, Senator Jeffords, Senator Collins, members of the committee. I am very delighted to be here today on behalf of the Chief State School Officers, which are my counterparts across the country as an elected State superintendent of public instruction. As Senator Murray mentioned, I am here both representing the organization and my own State of Washington and my experience as the school leader in Washington State that has constitutional responsibility for supervision of all the schools in our State.

I am kind of happy to bat clean-up here and be able to give you a perspective, kind of a policy perspective, from the State level, looking across schools in our State, 296 school districts that we have, about 1,900 schools, everywhere from Orient and Stehekin, who are two very, very tiny schools, as small as they have in Vermont, I would say, and then Seattle's that are the closest comparable kind of urban district that we have, nowhere near the size of Chicago, but we have got everything in between.

This is my 35th year in education, so I have been a teacher and a counselor, a school administrator, an association leader among the teachers in my past life, and now head of our State education agency. And I love learning, I love kids, I love this business, and I think we have a tremendous opportunity with what we are doing in the States with the standards-based reform, and there is just an incredibly important Federal role for this.

So as I think about what your role here is to try to take resources and policy and do the best you can to implement across the miles—it is a long way from this Washington to my Washington on the other side of the country—and to make sure that what you do really gets to the results that you intend to do. So I would like to kind of give you my perspective from hard knocks on that one as a person working in the State.

In the years that I have taught, I have taught poor kids, mostly, in Bethel, AK, in Wareham, MA, and then on the east side of Tacoma in my State of Washington for a number of years. And what I have seen the Federal role being is kind of a twofold thing: number one, it is to help kids that have some special challenge in their life to get enough of a bump to beat the odds and to supplement what the district and the State funding sources will do to help those kids; and the second major role that the Feds have played, really, is to try to leverage change through the use of the Federal dollars. And what you did in 1994 when you reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is, of course, the major driver of the Federal help for education, is you were pushing standards-based reform and accountability. And I think that was an excellent, excellent move on the part of the Congress, and I think you need to stay the course with that and you need to add some capacity building for us. You need to help us to integrate these programs so that we really can look at all of the children, but bring the Federal programs and the responsibilities for the targeted groups of kids in Title I and other programs into the kinds of things that Lula has been talking to you about and David has talked to you about and that you mentioned in terms of the studies that you found.

So I want you to stay the course and reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and particularly as Title I, as you said, Senator Jeffords, is the linchpin of the Federal effort in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And I hope it stays together and we can begin to integrate some of the pieces.

Specifically, as we are working in Washington, we have—and I have a little booklet I could leave with you, but we have a strategy for school improvement in Washington that is similar to what you heard about in Vermont and Illinois and other States in the country. We have State learning goals in our State law now because it is a local function, education is, a State responsibility, and it is obviously a Federal priority. So, in our responsibility at the State level, we now have for the first time in the history of our State some very clear learning goals, and we are accountable for learning results with kids, not just did we teach them but did they learn.

So we broke those goals down into what are called essential learnings. It is our academic standards, and we have tests now in our State that measure the results of the kids' learning of these standards. And it is part of what you did in 1994. We are starting to measure progress in our Title I schools on the basis of our State assessments. And this past 2 years are the first 2 years we have had the opportunity to do that. We have 1 year of improvement, growth that we have seen that I will talk about a little bit more this morning. But with those goals and assessments, and then an accountability system at the State, if we continue Title I and we continue the program components that you have with it and expand those components, we have the chance to really use Title I resources to reach all the kids in our State, and we desperately need the Federal money to assist us with the State dollars that we have.

So, more specifically, I think you ought to reauthorize Title I, and you ought to expand it. There are about half the kids in the country, not just in Washington but in other States, that cannot get access to that program, and make sure that you keep the standards and accountability in place for that.

The impact of Title I is starting to come up. They just did the disaggregation of the NAEP data, and they went to the schools with the highest poverty, 75 percent or more, and, clearly, that closing of the gap that Bill just described, of the poor kids with the rest of the kids in the school, is happening because of the use of resources of Title I. You can see it in the places where it is the highest area of concentration of poverty.

The Chief State School Officers have put together a proposal that I would like to enter into the record from the Chiefs that looks at being "First in the World," and it is kind of a vision of looking at the Federal role helping States to have the kinds of reform success that all the kids will be ready for the 21st century. And, specifically, with Title I, it is the kids that are struggling with poverty.

We just did three different studies in my State this fall. We have had 2 years of our new State assessment, which has reading and thinking. You have to read to learn and—learn to read and then read to learn to be successful on these assessments. They are closer to NAEP than the norm reference tests that we used to use for Title I. They are better tests, and they are more respected, and we are paying attention to the results.

So there were three studies that we did, one with a business partnership we worked with, one out of my agency in schools that made major gains in mathematics in the first year of change in our State assessment, and one that was done by Salem Pacific University. All three of them came up with the same results. The schools that made breakthroughs compared to schools that just sat there for a year and did not change were schools where there was real collaboration across the entire school, where teachers, parents, administrators, kids, they had an academic focus and they spent time on it. Everybody agreed they were going to do it. Then they put their money on it. They put their staff development on it. They increased the amount of time they taught math and reading in those schools. They reduced class size by reorganizing the way they did business during the day.

Schools like Liberty Elementary School in Snohomish County, in Snohomish School District in my State, went from 23 percent of their kids at grade level to 56 percent of their kids at grade level in 1 year's time by reorganizing as a total school the way they did business. And what we found was it did not matter if you had a site counselor or you did not, and all the kind of structures we talk about. What really happened was people sat down and said poverty is no excuse.

These studies were done across the board at breakthrough schools. I particularly focused in on the low-income schools because my goal in Washington is to break the correlation between poverty and low student achievement and get the schools so that in 5 or 6 years when you look in our State you will not see that disaggregated pattern of poor kids and low scores that you see right now in my State and any State your want to look at in the country.

So no matter how many poor kids who were in the schools, they could make astounding gains by this concentrated effort and the use of the expertise of teachers. No one program jumped out of these studies as being the magic bullet because the teachers had to supplement in every single program. We have got a one-size-fits-all curriculum that does not work when kids need different routes to get to these high goals.

So continuing the program elements of Title I which include the base funding that goes out there, and then your program improvement sections, which require the accountability, and we strongly support increasing the amount of dollars for those program improvements. We have very few dollars at the State level, and I think part of what David was talking about in Vermont—and we would say the same thing in Washington—we need the capacity to have some dollars to focus on programs to reach out to the schools that are not turning around fast enough. We are going to do some of this in our State, but we also need the flexibility to do that through Title I.

To give you a quick example, we did a program last year in Washington called Washington Reading Corps, and we had priority one schools that were the lowest-performing schools on our State assessment that were targeted for those dollars. One of the companies that was interested in making money on their product and being able to market this opportunity with ed reform sent out a little template to the schools and just said put your name in the blank. We have looked at what you have to do to get access to the program, and money went directly to the schools. So in many cases, districts did not even know if schools were applying.

They literally put their name in the blank and sent in this proposal, and then bought into a program that was a tutoring program. I am not knocking the tutoring program, but the problem was they did not think systemically. They did not do what these schools in these studies that we saw that really sat down and made a schoolwide plan in order to use the resources. So as we look at program improvement, we need to help schools that do not know how to turn around get the resources and the planning to turn around.

The schoolwides are excellent. I think you should keep the 50 percent poverty factor there. We got a waiver in Seattle just recently from Secretary Riley that they wanted to be able to use all their Title I funds in a mix with bilingual and immigrant education. And because they had a weighted student formula, they were making sure the money got to the targeted kids, and so Secretary Riley was able to grant him the waiver even though—and they are doing schoolwides all over Seattle.

So between Ed-Flex, which we are very happy that you just passed—or I think it is almost—it is not really the law of the land yet, I guess, but you are getting close to it. We are very excited about that, and specific waivers to make sure that we are targeting the money and we are being accountable for the results, then I think that 50 percent threshold—and the Chiefs would agree with that across the country, that we keep some threshold there.

Then the third area that is in Title I, the third program component of comprehensive school reform, the Obey-Porter legislation, that has been very helpful because it has taken research-based models and poor schools, in order to access the money, have had to think again, like in our research in Washington, about how they would use those moneys.

So I would say expand it, continue it, keep the accountability in there, make sure that—you don't have to worry as much about the inputs on accountability as long as we keep disaggregating the data, as Bill talked about, so that we look at the results with the targeted group of kids, and make sure that where you are trying to send your money for children with special challenges that you see the results with those kids, and not just statewide data. We are doing that in Washington. My colleagues are doing that all over the country. So that you could look at the outcomes that we achieve with the kids.

Then, finally, I would say that what we also need to do—there are new roles—and I guess this is a point that I have very strong feelings about. There are new roles emerging. If you start with the end in mind in your schools, if you go down to the kids and say the kids have to learn to read and write with skill and do their mathematics and problem solve, and you back up from the kids to the school, the district, the State, the regional levels, the national levels, if you start thinking about the accomplishment of the children, it turns everything around. It is not just what strategies we use, but did they work with the kids.

So if we are to change what we are doing in the whole system, we need to build capacity. We have a role at the State education agency; 296 school districts should not have to do the research on reading one district at a time. We should be doing it with the best educators in our State, and then putting it online and giving it back to them, with the implications for the practice that they are doing.

Lula and David both mentioned research in their discussion today. So we need to—the combination of the roles in this system are going to achieve excellence. The teachers in my State want to teach school. They say, Give me a good curriculum, Terry; you have got the outcomes clear; we are accountable for these results; make sure I have got good resources and material and I have got some support and training for myself to be able to do the job.

Districts have to coordinate some of that, and there are regional and State resources that need to be out there supporting the change that happened. And obviously in the Federal role, what we want is to keep a targeted impact of the program, but help us to integrate, so not just with Title I but with all of the new program elements, the things that—your after-school program and the class size reduction, pulling that together so that we can let districts do one application and have one accountability plan at their school that reaches all the groups of children that they have.

So if we can keep the flexibility to integrate and we could give you information back that is clear that we are targeting kids, what has happened in Washington is because every school and district is now available for the results of learning. Our local superintendents are in watching how we teach reading now, and they do not *know who a Title I child is versus a child in the bilingual children* versus a child in the mainstream or the gifted program. They want their school to get those kids to the standards. And it now gives me an opportunity to leverage the Federal resources with our State resources in a much more powerful way, and we are going to see those schools that have not improved for years making great gains like the ones that are in our study.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Bergeson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. TERRY BERGESON

On behalf of the Council of Chief State School Officers, I am happy to be with you and have this opportunity to comment on the reauthorization of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I am Terry Bergeson, the elected Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction is the state agency responsible for providing leadership, assistance, and resources to Washington's 296 school districts and 2,100 public schools. I am here representing the state of Washington and the Council of Chief State Officers.

Washington State, working under state legislation that preceded Goals 2000 and federal reform efforts, has four state learning goals broken down into state academic standards, grade level benchmarks, and an assessment system that includes basic skills measures as well as challenging thinking skills and performance, Prior to my election as superintendent, I was Executive Director of the Commission on Student Learning which involved thousands of Washington stakeholders in die development of standards and assessments in the state.

Education is a local function, a state responsibility, and a federal priority. I am delighted to be here to speak as a state chief and on behalf of CCSSO on the reauthorization of the ESEA. The issues I want to emphasize are the following.

STAY THE COURSE

Title I helps students with major challenges in their lives succeed academically despite the odds. Educational reform in Washington and across the United States is organized around breaking the correlation between poverty and student achievement. Title I programs must be continued and expanded to meet the needs of 50 percent of poor children not currently being supported by Title 1.

The 1994 reauthorization put the infrastructure for educational reform in place with challenging standards, performance assessments, and accountability systems, These are largely in place in all states. The 1999 reauthorization should provide the leadership, assistance, and resources needed for implementation so that all of America's children will be prepared for the requirements of the twenty-first century, and the United States will have a system of education that is first in the world.

The newest national assessment of Title I documents its effects. Students in the highest poverty schools (75 percent or more economically disadvantaged students) are accomplishing their achievement at a rate that is measurably closing the gap between their performance and that of other students.

ACCELERATION AND FOCUSING OF EFFORT

Title I should be authorized in the context of a bold, new first in the world framework as recommended by the Council of Chief State School Officers. Under this broad vision, Title I is the lynchpin of support for children in poverty so that they can accelerate catching up with their peers and meet challenging standards. I submit the council's proposal for the record.

As we implement state reform, we are learning more about how we can accelerate the academic progress of high poverty schools as well as all schools, Three studies examining state educational reform efforts have just been completed in our state, and they provide valuable insights.

- The first, conducted by Jeffrey Fouts and graduate students at Seattle Pacific University, studied some 40 schools using a restructuring index to examine the degree and depth of change.
- Paul Hill of the University of Washington's Public Policy School carried out a second study, sponsored by Washington is business-supported Partnership for

Learning. The study matched 35 schools that made gains in assessments with schools not making gains.

- The third study, implemented by Peggy Vatter of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, consisted of telephone interviews with 53 schools, including some high poverty schools that had made major gains in mathematics assessments between 1997 and 1998.

The results of these studies were similar. Schools that improved were characterized by the following.

INVOLVEMENT AND CONSENSUS OF STAKEHOLDERS

In the improved schools, teachers, parents, and administrators collaborated on a common academic focus. The successful poor schools in all three studies began with the expectation and belief that poverty is no excuse for low achievement. It was their responsibility to find ways to increase the learning and achievement of all students. They developed plans and implemented them with an intentional focus and a constancy of effort.

EXPERTISE OF TEACHERS

Teachers realized and used their expertise to diagnose the individual needs of students and to provide the supplemental resources and activities needed to increase the learning of all students. They realized that although structured programs are useful, no program has all the answers. They used their own knowledge to adapt programs and, when necessary, leverage federal, state, and local resources.

RETHINKING THE USE OF TIME

The schools reconsidered their use of time and restructured many of their traditional practices, such as increasing reading and mathematics time; preteaching in a Sunrise School; providing after school, summer, or tutoring programs; and using cross-grade tutoring.

The point of these studies is that schools need support to develop and implement a whole, school-change effort. Title I funds help poor districts support academically struggling students. In addition, three school-focused components of Title I-program improvement, schoolwide programs, and comprehensive school reform-involve a state leadership role in the type of capacity building and planning for school change that was seen in our Washington studies.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

State resources must be expanded to allow SEAs to provide more in-depth capacity-building activities. We strongly support President Clinton's $200 million increase in program improvement, earmarked for states and local districts to assist the 6,900 Title I schools identified in greatest need of program improvement. This increase should be in the reauthorization authority for state education agencies to use up to 2.5 percent of Title I funds to assist schools when student achievement fails to meet standards. States must be able to bundle state, local, and federal funds together in comprehensive school-by-school strategies.

State accountability systems identify schools where achievement of eligible students is not accelerating sufficiently to enable them to reach high standards. Yet the majority of states are finding the .5 percent to I percent of Title I funds earmarked for program improvement falls far short of the needs of these schools.

SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS

Schoolwide programs are very important for schools with large concentrations of poverty. We urge maintaining the 50 percent poverty criteria for schoolwide programs. Other schools with special circumstances should have waiver options such as those provided by Ed Flex. Seattle just received a waiver for some schools with less than 50 percent poverty, which was needed in order to provide Tide I quality programs and to use funds from several programs such as bilingual education, immigrant education, and migrant education.

The council's reauthorization proposal would provide a way for schools to organize and deliver coherent integrated instructional services for students eligible under one or more of these programs whether they are in schoolwide programs or not.

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM

The Comprehensive School Reform Program (Porter-Obey) should be maintained and expanded as well. Comprehensive school reform brings the best of the research-based models to Title I school including the lowest performing and highest poverty schools. It has provided a strong incentive to schools to undertake focused and sustained improvement planning and implementation efforts, such as those described in Washington's research studies.

New initiatives such as the 21st Century Community Learning Centers after school and class size reduction programs should also be components of Title I, so they can be integrated into design of school-by-school change efforts and focused on the students with the greatest needs. As part of Title 1, the SEAs would administer these programs to local education agencies, using the single ESEA consolidated plan and application for efficiency and effectiveness. The SEA would use up to I percent of funds to administer programs.

As stated earlier, education remains a local function, a state responsibility, and a federal priority As educational reform efforts focus on accountability for student learning results, new roles at all three levels are emerging. Educational excellence is attained when these roles are articulated, respected, and supported. Those who claim they are not needed have denigrated the roles of states and districts; however, schools can't do all the work alone.

The state has a critical role in providing standards and assessment leadership and in supporting statewide educational technology systems and regional delivery of technical services. Moreover, there is an essential role for districts in providing services to schools, so they can concentrate their efforts on instructional programs and teaching and learning. These leadership roles do not direct money from local schools, but they provide common services that support the work of local schools. They leverage the use of those local dollars more effectively.

Our Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee of the Washington State Legislature just completed a study that documented a consistent spending pattern across wealthy and poor mid large and small districts. Ninety percent of funds are used for teaching and learning: 60 percent for instruction, 10 percent for instructional services, and 20 percent for school4cvel support services with 10 percent used for administration and technical services. This is consistent with another study conducted in Washington by die Office of the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Education.

Emphasis should be given to the importance of integrating all federal programs and funds, not just Title I, through comprehensive state, district, and school plans that link federal funds with state and local efforts. Integrated plans and expanded Ed Flex authority will provide the necessary capacity for more effective use of Title I and other ESEA resources. State, district, and school accountability for these funds should be tied to the performance results of our students. Since these funds are allocated for students with a variety of special needs, performance results should be disaggregated and reported by student population.

We would also ask the U.S. Department of Education to work with states and districts in developing models for effective integrated programs that will scale up the success of education reform across all groups of students.

I've been in education for 35 years as a teacher, a counselor, a teacher leader, a school administrator, and now state superintendent. The past six years have been the most rewarding. I'm observing changes that I would never have dreamed possible, The momentum for student learning has been established, and we urge you to help us keep moving toward the goal of first in the world. If we stay the course, continue to learn and be accountable, our students will compete successfully in world challenges of the future.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED BY SENATOR MURRAY

Question 1

Dr. Bergeson, you and I have worked closely on efforts to bring educational technology to scale and improve student achievement, teacher training, classroom resources, and many other areas in a systemic way, I think the committee would benefit from hearing your update on these efforts and your assessment of where we need to go from here. What are your thoughts on this topic?

Answer 1

The infrastructure of educational reform—the Essential Academic Learning Requirements, the benchmarks, and the assessment system—is in place in Washington and in most other states. Initial implementation has given us an understanding of the scope and difficulty of the full implementation of reform. In Washington, we must support and work with some 60,000 educators to extend their knowledge and skills and use them in more precise ways.

Educational reform requires not simply learning a few skills but rather rethinking and learning new ways of identifying diverse needs of students, expanding types of instruction, learning how to manage curriculum and instruction for kids at different levels of learning, learning how to understand and use the results of assessments, and learning how to integrate technology into the curriculum in effective ways. In short, many teachers who have been successful with middle class students are being asked to learn how to deal with a complex situation of diverse learning styles, levels of experience, as well as learn new technologies. This is a large-scale cultural change that is happening in the context of real accountability for student learning.

There are many exemplary teachers and administrators who have the understandings and skills; to operate successfully in this environment, but scaling up positive change requires systemic approaches, States will be required to become more active and supportive in the provision of information, training, technical assistance, consultation, and networking, We are engaged in a learning process, and many of our educators are heavily involved in their own learning. Others, however, remain isolated with relatively few opportunities to learn and receive feedback. We have to find ways of speeding up the learning process.

States need capacity building resources, and districts need capacity building resources. I would recommend that Goals 2000 and Title II be designated as state capacity building programs that require well-designed state plans with indicators for evaluation. Similarly, I would recommend that Title VI be designed as a local capacity building program with required indicators and evaluation. This would give states and districts the flexibility they need as well as retain the integrity of categorical programs for disadvantaged youth.

Goals 2000 has been a controversial program to some, but it is uniformly praised by local educators for its flexibility in helping them with their local reform efforts. Its popularity is based on its relevance to their concerns and their involvement in determining their priorities. These should characterize any local capacity building program.

Question 2

I've been in discussions with local school district superintendents who are sending recommendations to their school boards about using this year's class size money. While I share your perspective that states should view class size reduction as part of their overall efforts at education reform, and while I see Title I as more closely tied to class size reduction than Title VI where we have it today, what can you tell us about predictability for local school districts and the release of class size funds this summer?

Answer 2

Districts and schools are very appreciative of federal assistance in reducing class size, especially in early elementary school classrooms. In the larger districts, schools am faced with hiring new teachers and making the physical accommodations to include more teachers. Their problems are finding certificated teachers and persuading them to work under an uncertainty about future funding.

In the larger districts these problems can be dealt with, especially in view of their ability to use some funds for teacher training, and recruitment. Smaller districts that are more isolated face different problems. They may not receive enough to hire a full time teacher, and the distances do not lend themselves to any sharing of teachers. The use of federal class size funds for partial FTEs would solve this problem. Despite the problems, the effort is an important step forward. We look ahead with the hope that funding for future years will be determined soon, This will allow local schools to plan and retain more stability. Without some timely action regarding future funding, the goals cannot be fully achieved.

Question 3

Much of the work you and I have done revolves around literacy and reading development for young children. Can you give the Committee an update on the Washington Reading Corps and other efforts to improve reading in Washington State? How do you see the Reading Excellence Act as helping here?

Answer 3

As the Superintendent of Public Instruction, I had initiated a program to focus on early reading skills in Washington schools. Governor Gary Locke and the Washington State Legislature provided funds for materials to strengthen student decoding skills and funds for the Washington Reading Corps. The Washington Reading Corps provides support for summer programs, which provide instruction by certificated teachers, and is supported by tutoring and mentoring. Some 191 schools have received funding.

Preliminary evaluations are most positive. A large majority of students made gains during summer programs, even in programs held for only three weeks. Anecdotal reports that the summer gains have been reflected in improved interest and learning when students returned to school. One of the by products of cross-age tutoring where students tutor younger children has been a reduction of disciplinary problems as well as gains for both groups.

Programs are, currently in place for the rest of the 1998–99 school year and for the summer of 1999. We are enthused about programs that extend students time on reading, their fluency, and their work with tutors. We look forward to extending the program with funds from the Reading Excellence Act.

Question 4

You and I share the belief that educational success is best achieved through creating partnerships with educators, communities, families, and students. Can you talk about why it is so important when engaging young people in these discussions to include their thoughts in a very authentic and respectful way? How do you see young people engaging in education reform? What are the implications for our schools looking at young people as more of a resource? How do we get adults to see that they have some work to do when it comes to building young people's engagement in this partnership?

Answer 4

Many of our middle and high school students experience school as a routine, have to, put of their lives. They have not made the connection between the learning that schools provide and the quality of their lives, It is a human characteristic that we tend to value things when we are engaged in relevant activities and see connections and relationships to our present and future lives. By engaging students as true partners in their education, we can help them make the connection between the learning that occurs, in the classroom and their lives outside of school as well as their future lives as adult citizens, parents, and workers.

Ultimately, we have got to do a better job of making learning come alive for middle and high school students. Engaging them as respected partners in their own learning and their school community helps students to see the connections between what they are learning and why they need to learn it. It improves the bottom line of increasing the academic and life skills of our nations young people. Schools districts such as Wapato, Central Kitsap, and Shoreline in Washington State have seen the tremendous impact of involving youth in meaningful partnerships. The overall school climate is improved; there is a culture of respect and appreciation among the students and between the students and staff, and academic performance is increasing. We've seen a higher rate of success in the attainment of personal goals in the years immediately following high school.

I personally have seen the powerful impact of engaging young people as meaningful and respected partners. As the Executive Director of the Central Kitsap School District I worked with a group of students to design, plan, and run a youth summit to explore important issues facing their lives, their schools, their families, and their community. The 250 students who participated in the summit gained a deeper understanding of important issues such as economic development, growth management, human relations, and education. These 250 students had the unique opportunity to work in partnership with 40 adult loaders in their community-business people, elected officials, the media, and school personnel-to develop creative and informed solutions to our communities toughest problems. The adults who took time from their already too busy days to participate in the summit were deeply struck by the insight, dedication, and enthusiasm of the students, many of whom the adults previously thought of as bad kids. The students who ran the summit as the planners, spokes-people, decision makers, and facilitators gained a connection to their community and a now level of investment in their own learning. Some of them even put in enough work to earn high school credit. Several of the students commented that they finally understood the importance of their English class when they were asked to write a letter asking the president of the Chamber of Commerce to participate in the Summit.

As far as the actual education reform process is concerned, our young people have much to offer. As the individuals who know our schools from the participant's perspective, they often see solutions and strategies for improving student performance that we can't even begin to imagine. In Washington State students participate as members of our commissions, state board of education, planning groups, school-based decision making bodies, and professional conferences, workshops, and summits. When presented with the opportunity to be engaged in school reform efforts, we have found that students from all backgrounds are willing and able to participate. Their impact is strong and significant. They bring creativity, insight, levity, and a unique ability to transcend politics.

The strategies are out there, and we see on a case-by-case basis that they are working. We have plenty of anecdotal evidence for it, including young people who can speak articulately about the impact on their own lives. However, we must do a better job of documenting the impacts of youth involvement and researching the impact on classroom learning and success in life. We have got to provide adults with the tools to engage young people as meaningful and respected partners in their education and their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you all for your excellent testimony. I am sure you share my frustration. Here we are 15 years after we got the warning that we were not doing well, and now we are just beginning to get some hope and feelings that we are turning things around. But we still have not got them turned around.

Ms. BERGESON. They are coming.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes it is coming. But that is why we are here today.

This reauthorization is incredibly important. We have got to make sure that we do it properly and appropriately and that we do it with great care.

I would just like to try and point out some of the areas where we think we have sort of a consensus about how do we get there, especially in the utilization of Title I.

First of all, we recognize very strongly that early childhood education is incredibly important. The brain expands and develops, and we have all the brain tests, but what do we do with Title I? Is that something we should be looking at as to how we get into early education? Should we be looking to see whether this particular part of the education strategy should reach back? And how do we reach back to get identification of disabilities and all those things done before they get to school? Does Title I have a role in that?

All of you, I think, mentioned professional development. We are going to be looking very closely at how we can expand professional development, and that is incredibly important.

Also, it should not come as a shock that we are suddenly realizing that we ought to have standards. It amazes me it has taken us that long to understand that we have to challenge our kids. We have had, as I said, a warning for 15 years that our Asian and European competitors challenge their children much more than we do, and it is time that we got our challenges up to those levels.

So in a way, it is exciting to see things beginning to turn around, but it is frustrating to think how long it has taken us to get here. We want to make sure this year we do not leave this bill without fully examining the problems. We must take a close look at what we should change or modify in order to be sure we make better progress with the utilization of technology and training and remedial training, especially through the utilization of computers and similar things.

I am shocked to find out that nobody is evaluating these programs. We have 100 of them around, and I know they work because I have seen it in my own family. Take my daughter, 20 years ago. She was having a hard time with algebra. I was out in Baltimore and saw some programs they had there. I got my daughter into it, and she zoomed right ahead in algebra after she had that choice. That was 20 years ago. But not that much progress has been made in that utilization.

There are a lot of things we have to do, so I am very pleased to have you here. I talked with Congressman Goodling, the chairman of the House committee. He and I entered Congress together, and we agree on many things, one of which is that we are going to go slow. We are going to make sure we do a thorough job and make sure that when we are finished, we will have examined fully all of the educational programs in ESEA and seen what we could do to make sure we maximize their utility.

Several of you have mentioned the importance of expanding Title I early childhood education programs. Should we have a set-aside within Title I designated to early childhood? And if so, would you suggest how we structure such an area? What ages or grades should be targeted for early childhood? Would preschool be included? How would you coordinate a new early childhood strategy with the already successful Even Start Program, which technically falls under Title I in the Head Start Program? To answer that I think would probably take more than 5 minutes, but, please, who wants to start?

Ms. FORD. I would like to start. We have a program in Chicago known as Parents as Teachers First and Cradle-to-the Classroom. Cradle-to-the-Classroom is an intervention program whereas we go in and have pregnant and parenting teens begin to learn how to nurture their infants. And I wanted to say that because right now our colleges and universities really do not have teachers who come out and know how to work with 0 to 3. So we are looking at a model whereas we will go in and work with those children earlier. We will work with them when they get out of the hospital, because oftentimes if we reach children early enough, we can work them through certain learning disabilities, especially with our premature infants and our infants of parents who have been addicted or have fetal alcohol syndrome, two kinds of children.

Those are the ways that we could begin to screen these infants. So I do not think that we need to—I think it should be a set-aside, especially for those high-risk youngsters from 0 to 3. If we can go in—because research has shown us this, and what we have done with 40 parent advocates in our high schools working with those pregnant and parenting teens, because oftentimes they do not know how to nurture a child. They do not know how to shake a rattle from the left to the right so that the child's eyes can begin to focus and go from side to side.

These are the kinds of things that our low-income infants need early on to get—we have found that once we get them in 3rd grade, oftentimes it might be too late if they indeed have a learning deficit.

Ms. BERGESON. In Washington, our Governor Gary Locke is very interested, just put a task force together, to look at the impact of the research that we have on early childhood. And one of the things I know in Washington is we have many groups that do early childhood stuff, and we have not really had the early childhood programs, the Head Start and the ECAP in our State, which is kind of a State Head Start kind of program. They have not been under education. They have been under various kinds of agencies, and there are lots of turf wars and there are lots of—there are some wonderful things going on in different programs.

But when you get down to a school, the school is trying to integrate the services, again, of a variety of people who are vendors of the program or who are the people operating the programs. And anything that you can do to kind of maybe even have some collaborative grants where you can look at changing that system in a State to build on the best of what is being done already in some of the programs that exist and make the link with the K–12 system stronger, and require some partnerships in that as people get together, so that we do not try to reinvent wheels that are already turning but we get things connected. Focus and intentionality.

I will tell you, what I am finding is if people can get the right information, the research is not in clear form for the classroom teacher and the parent, I mean, just what Lula is talking about, being able to translate some of what we know to what does that mean in the day-to-day life with your kid, that you can have so much power as a parent that you did not know you could have, from the parents that are oftentimes very discouraged and do not think they matter, they do not think they can do something in their children's lives.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. I will say a couple of things which are at least partly responsive to your question.

One is I was surprised, as I go around the country, to find out how much preschool is Title I rather than Head Start, and very impressive things are happening in some of those programs.

I am frustrated, as you are, Senator. I have a case where I represent black school children in Cincinnati, and we made an agreement about 4 years ago to take some special steps with respect to poor and low-achieving schools, and that included increasing the numbers of children in preschool and child development programs and starting at age 3.

For some reason, Cincinnati has not been able—or has not done it, and I think that the fact that scores have not improved is related to the fact that they have failed to make those kinds of investments. So I think they are worth, very much worth making.

I want to echo what Ms. Ford said. The need to diagnose at an early stage disabilities is, I think, pervasive around the country. Now, as part of the 1994 amendments, there were provisions for coordination of health and social services. I cannot really say how—I do not really have a lot of information about how that is working, but that might be something that you might want to take a look at in the course of hearings for this reauthorization, because I think the provision goes in the right direction, and I just wonder what is happening under that provision.

The CHAIRMAN. I have not really thought too much about a set-aside per se, but I would say that over probably 50 percent of the Title I money in Vermont currently is being used in that K–3 arena. And if you take a look at the types of services that Vermont offers in Title I, pre-K services are third only behind reading and math. So if you look at the number of students served in reading, it is about 6,500; in math it is about 2,500; in pre-K it is about 500. But I think it is growing, and part of it, from the Vermont perspective that I know and live, flexibility is a real big key. And so to necessarily mandate that we do that at the early stage might go against the grain a little bit.

But I think just awareness, just bringing the awareness that this is a very important program that has a lot of impact and early intervention, and also to say, to build on what Lula said, if we use the parents—and Title I already says that we should have professional development for parents—this could be a step in just embracing parents in a professional development kind of way at the early stages.

Mr. RIDDLE. Let me mention just a couple of relevant things. First, it has long been encouraged that Title I funds be used at local and State option for pre-K education, especially in the 1994 amendments, several small provisions especially encouraging that. However, the percentage nationwide has always been quite small. As I said, most children are served in K–6, but very few—or pre-K-6, very few at the pre-K level. It has been growing, but it is still in the neighborhood of 2 to 3 percent of all Title I participants. So it is still quite small when it is simply a matter of encouragement. That might cause you to think about some reservation.

As far as coordination with Even Start, in Even Start programs, the early childhood education services are usually provided by some other entity, by Head Start or some entity other than Even Start itself. It is usually just coordinating that. So coordination with Even Start might not be such a problem if you expand the pre-school provision under Title I.

Also, there is just a very recent report from NCES on pre-school participation showing for the first time in quite a while that in the aggregate pre-kindergarten participation has gone down somewhat. It might be of interest in considering it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you.

Senator Wellstone.

Senator WELLSTONE. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I first of all apologize to the panelists. And I have a press conference that is my press conference at 11:00; otherwise, I would not go to it. So I am very frustrated here.

I do not know whether I even have time to ask the questions I want to ask. I have a couple of comments. Dr. Bergeson and I think also Bill Taylor made this comment on what we did in 1994 in the ways of building partnerships between schools and communities. I know that one area that my wife and I have been looking into—although I think you could expand it—is the effects of the violence in homes on the children, even if they themselves are not battered, and the ways in which we need to sort of figure—which really affects their ability to learn, but quite often it is not clear that we always know that in the schools, and so somehow bringing together the people that are kind of down in the trenches working on this at the community level with school people.

I also have just been shocked, even though I do not think I am very naive about these issues because I try to spend a lot of time in a lot of the neighborhoods, at the number of school people that tell me that not only are students by kindergarten or first grade behind in terms of intellectual learning curve, not only is there a learning gap but that many in their short lives have seen things that are pretty awful and are really struggling, and there needs to be a way of providing them with some support, because even with great teachers, great facilities, and everything else, they still may not be able to do it.

I mean, it is just sort of what is happening in the lives of too many children in America, and somehow how we do that at the community level, I do not know. I think it is a community-based response.

I guess the only point I want to make—and I guess there are two questions, one for Mr. Riddle. The only reason I get nervous about set-asides or pre-K is that I think then we are into a real zero-sum game. I mean, we have a limited—Title I was fully funded maybe in 1965, and it has been nowhere near fully funded ever since. I guess I would ask Mr. Riddle: If we were to really be able to serve all the children that would be eligible, what would we be spending per year?

Mr. RIDDLE. Well, there are two possible ways of answering that. One is to look at the allocation formula for basic grants, which has a maximum payment amount, which would be approximately $24 billion if it were fully funded.

Another way to look at it is to look at the—that is looking at it in terms of the poor children allocation formula, expenditure factor. If you look at it in terms of estimates of the percentage of eligible children served, those have normally been in the neighborhood of 50, 55 percent, so that would imply a doubling of funding.

Senator WELLSTONE. Yes. You know, one point here is that it becomes this awful—I remember this young African American woman who really took me on at a high school in North Minneapolis called North High when I was talking about the importance of getting it right and I was talking about this for even before age 3. And this one woman said: Well, is this triaged? What about us? Are you giving up on us high school students?

And I look at sort of the allocation of this money, and the more you go up age-wise, the less there is, and I understand it. But with all due respect, I am uncomfortable with it. That is what happens.

Ms. BERGESON. We have a surplus, though, and we could just put more in.

Senator WELLSTONE. I agree. Listen, that is my point. If we are serious about this and we now know that we are beginning to know what works and we are beginning to do some things really well, why in the world is it so severely underfunded?

Ms. BERGESON. And another thing, Senator Wellstone, there is a new study. I think it was in the New York Times the other day. David Hawkins is a researcher in our State at the University of Washington, and they have done some very excellent research on the kind of learning environment and home environment issues that you were talking about with the children. And we do know some things that will work to take kids that have had that kind of crippling experience and help them in the early years of school and build that into what we are thinking about educationally. So there is finally some data on that that we can use.

Senator WELLSTONE. See, I would think that the place where the Federal Government is a real player is pre-K and Title I, which now there is an overlap, but I would think that if we were really serious about this, we—well, we are serious about it, but I think the funding level would be substantially greater than it is. I mean, that is where—along with some of the core requirements and accountability.

One final question for Mr. Taylor. In 1994, when we reauthorized ESEA, we had some protections to make sure that low-income students or disadvantaged students were not marginalized—this was part of your work—by the educational process, that there were standards, you know, professional staff.

Now, on the Citizens' Commission, at least in your executive summary, your report suggests the law is not always being followed, and I quote. It says, "The shortcomings of the Title I program flow in large measure from the failure of Federal, State, and local officials to heed the call of the new law to renovate and reform the educational system."

Could you share just some of the problems that you have identified and tell us what you think we ought to be doing to fix them?

Mr. TAYLOR. There are several kinds of problems. One is we have emphasized even in this hearing that there was supposed to be a single set of standards, high standards, for all children. And, unfortunately, the Department of Education, instead of insisting that the State enact uniform standards, allowed the States to do a patchwork of standards, including local-level standards, so that, just to use an example, you could have different standards in Beverly Hills or Berkeley than you had in Los Angeles or a poor area like East Palo Alto.

That really is not acceptable. If we mean what we say that all children can learn at high standards, then we have got to pursue that.

Also, there simply is not enough insistence that all children be included in the process. In Philadelphia, David Hornbeck says, tells the schools, that if you do not participate—a child who does not participate is counted as a zero for purposes of assessment. And that means that there is a real incentive not to tell the poor kids or the black kids or the disabled kids or the English language learners, you stay home on the day of the test, or we will exempt you because you are not conversant enough in English. The answer is these children need to be accommodated and encouraged to participate.

There are several other areas, including the fact which Mr. Riddle mentioned, that we have got, what, almost 30 States that do not have performance standards yet, moving very slowly in that whole area. So there is a lot to do.

But having said that, I think we cannot give up on the process. As you well know, Senator, this is the time to do it. We have got a surplus. There are surpluses in the State. The last time around we extended—we said we ought to be caring about high schools. Well, if we ought to be caring about high schools, then we have got to raise the money, raise the funding for elementary schools as well.

The final reason why we cannot afford not to do it this time around is I do not think we can come back here 5 years from now and say the public schools are still in trouble and we want more money and we want to proceed. We have got to show, all of us collectively have got to show results over the next 5 years, which means that Congress has to make the investment that will permit the results to be shown.

Senator WELLSTONE. I thank you, and I have to leave because I am late for this press conference, and they are going to wonder where I am. But I assume that the chairman will be back in just a moment.

This is near and dear to my heart, and I am not giving justice to each of you. Thank you very much for your work and thanks for being here.

I am just walking out on you. This feels terrible to me. I am Jewish. I mean, I am guilty about it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Sorry I missed that, whatever it was.

This is a busy time of the year, as you know, when the spring comes. Everybody pours in, especially from the North. They come down, and to be disappointed at this point because the snow on the ground is not what they are looking for in mid-March. Anyway——

Mr. TAYLOR. From Cabin fever to Potomac fever.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, right. It is my understanding that most school districts spend Title I funds at the elementary school level.

Mr. Riddle, is that correct?

Mr. RIDDLE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Riddle, do you have a breakdown as to how Title I dollars tend to be expended between early childhood, elementary, middle and high school?

Mr. RIDDLE. The data are available. It is in some detail in my written testimony, and I can provide additional detail. I do not have it immediately with me.

The CHAIRMAN. You can provide that, though, for us.

Mr. RIDDLE. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Thank you.

Ms. BERGESON. I am sure the Chiefs could you give you some state-by-state breakdowns, too.

But it is clearly mostly the primary grades in elementary school. I would assume that is the same pattern all over the country.

Mr. RIDDLE. Yes. Overall, it is 50 percent pre-K through 6; 5 percent 10 to 12; the remainder middle school, 15 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. OK. Thanks. That is a pretty good estimate.

Recent test scores indicate that our students perform well in the elementary/middle school years, and then there is a significant decline after middle school. Does this hold true for Title I students?

Ms. BERGESON. I would say that probably the answer to that is yes. And I think it is a very important question, and it is an important question as we look at, say, schoolwide models of the comprehensive school reform models. If you do not have a comprehensive reading program from the beginning, especially for poor kids, where you, one, make sure you have the phonics and the phonemic awareness for kids, oral language development, phonics, hearing sounds, being able to build the basic building blocks, but at the same time you have got to read to kids, you have got to expose them to good literature, you have got to get them to become readers, to want to think and read.

Because what happens is at about the 3rd grade/4th grade you assume kids have learned to read, and then they start having to read to learn, and they start getting into a curriculum that is a much broader base. They need a bigger vocabulary, they need the ability to make inferences and read different types of texts.

I know from our results with our State assessment in Washington, it is a thinking skills test in the 4th grade. It assumes they have learned to read, and they are having to read and think and decide things.

If you do not have a comprehensive program from the beginning, the kids get the basic skills, and they can get literal comprehension. But when they have to start doing something with that, they start to fall apart when the curriculum diversifies. That is why when Lula was taking about the reading and the content area, you get up into those intermediate grades and the middle school, you have got to broaden the vocabulary base, and you have got to get kids to understand that reading a science text is a little different than reading a poem or a short story, and the kids need to understand the difference and build those strategies.

So as we look at the programs in Title I, we have got to be careful that we do not get too narrow in the focus of just a skills-based program without the thinking skills in the literature or kids start falling apart in the upper grades.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us talk about the middle schools, which seems to be the critical area of concern with respect to the middle forgotten half, so to speak.

Relevancy of education at that point seems to diminish. Kids do not understand why they have to learn and drop out. Is that fairly accurate?

Ms. FORD. Well, actually, in Chicago, we only have 24 middle schools. Most of our schools are kindergarten through 8, and that is where we get our high-order thinking skills, as Dr. Bergeson said.

Once again, it goes back to quality teaching, and certainly if you have done the staff development that you need to do, we will get that quality teaching. But we must remember that our colleges and universities must begin to add another course to teaching because all teachers are teachers of reading, and we must be mindful of that fact because oftentimes they come out with just the methods courses. They do not know how to diagnose those courses. And once you get into high school, you need to specifically understand how to teach reading in the content area because you are still teaching reading.

When we looked at our middle-grade data, and we looked at our bench-mark grades, 6th and 8th grade, we find that once they get to 6th grade, we see a decline, as you said, and then we see a struggle in 7th grade. So that is where we went in and said we wanted oftentimes our teachers to begin to loop. That meant that that 6th grade teacher should possibly keep that 7th grade class and stay there with them because she is going to be able to know where their strengths and weaknesses are and begin to address them and never go back to remediation.

Oftentimes, we begin to remediate our children instead of accelerating them and that is one of the programs that we are doing in the City of Chicago is that we are saying accelerate our children, stop remediating them so much because they are still going to be tested at a higher level. And that is where we get that high quality for all of our children. We are looking at those intermediate grades because that is where we—we are not having as many problems at the 8th grade as we are with the 9th grade class. When they get into high school, that is where we see a greater decline because we test there, also.

Ms. BERGESON. We need some 90-day wonder programs for our middle and our high school kids. Because in the next 5, 6, 7, 8 years, what we are doing in Washington to build a foundation in the primary grades and moving it up through the system is going to be big payoff for those intermediate and middle grades in high schools. In the meantime, we cannot just write off, as the gentleman, Senator Wellstone said, we cannot just write off our high school kids.

We had a fellow named Larry Scholl in Yakima, at Davis High School. He is a reading teacher, an unusual breed of cat to find in the 9th and 10th grade, but he is a great reading teacher. And we took about 100 of the lowest-performing 9th grade students at Davis High School—which is a very heavily migrant community, so we know we have a lot of Title I migrant education—we took the kids that were the lowest performers on the Gates-McGinity in reading out of their total high school program and had a concentrated Literacy Day for almost 6 weeks. Kids made 4- and 5-years' gain, and they loved it.

We were not sure how the kids would take to the program because they were writing, reading, learning to read out loud, presenting their ideas. And they finally had, for the first time in their life for many of these kids, got caught up to the point where they could then re-enter the rest of their high school program.

Those are the kinds of things we need to do in summer schools and before-school programs for the next 4 or 5 years, concentrated effort to catch the kids that did not get that baseline.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with everything that has been said, but I want to add one thing, and that is that we should not overlook the problem that kids who reach these grades sometimes are victimized by a watered-down, dumbed-down curriculum, that they simply are not, even when they are motivated or can be motivated, they are not offered the kinds of courses that will allow them to succeed and allow them to perform well on NAEP and on international competitions and the rest. They do not get advanced algebra or trig or other things.

So that, it seems to me, the lesson in that is we really have to be serious about standards and about what kids ought to know, and we have got to insist that the curriculum gets aligned to the standards and gets changed in these places. And many of them are inner-city schools and some of them, I am sure, are rural poverty areas as well that simply do not offer children the opportunities to learn that they need, as we close out the century, as they say.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baroudi.

Mr. BAROUDI. I think what we find is that is the age where a lot of kids start to experiment with risky behaviors and that type of thing, and we have shown some success in our advocating for assets-built kind of curriculum and resiliency and that sort of thing.

And I think that ties in real well with what Terry was saying about the "no excuses" kind of mind-set that is really working, where schoolwide programs are working. So that understanding that that is the age where kids could easily become disenfranchised if they had a lot of other things going on in their lives that were not working, but if using an assets-building approach and a resiliency model seem to mediate that or ameliorate that, then I think that—we have been doing it mostly with Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities' moneys, but that does not mean that—again, in Vermont, since we are a consolidated group, Safe and Drug-Free Monies have to be articulated with the grant that comes in asking for the Title I money.

So I think that is a way that we can build in that middle school area, along with what other folks have said.

Ms. BERGESON. And it is another reason not to pull apart ESEA as you go through the reauthorization. If we fragment the programs further, what has happened since 1994—and the Department of Ed has been great about this, of starting to really support us in our efforts to do consolidated applications and integrated programs and make it a little easier on the accounting end to be able to pool resources and really get the bang for the buck overall in your school—if we do the same thing that Dave is talking about with our consolidated application in Washington, and we have got a coalition of teams now with all of the Federal programs that come under ESEA, and we just need more of that, and we need more of the ability to stay the course with these no coordinated efforts that we are using.

So as you look at the big reauthorization picture—I have heard at least people talking about that they might be trying to do several bills and kind of break up the whole ESEA thing—what we truly need in the States and the districts is the ability to have the simplest, most straightforward way to hang things together so that the school can think about a whole set of programs and pick the ones they need for the issues they are facing.

I do not know if that is your experience.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess I may not be communicating right, but what do we do to motivate the kids in the 6th, 7th and 8th grades? It seems to me we concentrate so much on you have got to go to college, and if you do not go to college, forget it, just limp yourself through. The record shows that half the kids that have graduated from high school are functionally illiterate, because they do not know any reason why they have to learn anything.

Ms. BERGESON. Well, see, that is where I think the Federal School to Work Initiative, we have a fourth goal in our State—we have got all of the communication skills, and the content areas, and thinking skills—and the fourth goal is seeing the connection between school and your future learning and work opportunities.

I was a counselor at one point in my career, and I used to do Career Fairs for 5th graders because 5th graders set goals. They want to figure out what to do when they grow up. And if you can get kids to see the connection, particularly children who are not sure what they could do——

The CHAIRMAN. What do you do, Ms. Ford?

Ms. FORD. I taught for 22 years, and I was a principal for 5 years. One of the things that I wanted to encourage my children, as you said, the Career to Work Program. But I wanted to make school fun for them because my children came out of such a dysfunctional background, and I had clubs, and I had criteria for each one of those clubs, and there were consequences and rewards.

One of the things that, for instance, if you wanted to be a cheerleader, basketball team, modern dance, student government, you could not come to school every day and not do your homework, you could not come to school being tardy because school, in some of their lives, was the first time they had an authority figure that meant that you had to do these kinds of things. And I related it always to the world of work. I reminded them that I could not, not come to work and keep my job.

I said, "Now, what would happen if your teacher did thus and so?" or if she were not competent in those kinds of fields? And that is how I related that.

I reminded them that everything that you do, you are going to have to learn how to read, and if you had money, you would have to know how to do math or somebody would take it away from you. These are the kinds of skills, I did not just press on them that they had to go to college, but I pressed on them that there were consequences and that if you did not go to college, you had to work, and there were certain areas of work. And we always had a Career Day. And as she said, you had goals that the children set, and you let the children do it collaboratively with their teachers. Any time you are in a classroom, I want the children to tell me what the rules and regulations are, and I did not want more than three.

If you let them set simple goals for themselves, they will realize that there is a world out there, and everybody cannot be a Michael Jordan, and everybody cannot play football. And I wanted them to know what would happen, if you were indeed a Michael Jordan and you broke your arm or leg, you still needed something to fall back on, and that should be education.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to put in an award for counselors. I was at a meeting last week with Gene Garcia, who was at the Department of Education and now is head of the Ed School in Berkeley, and he was talking about Hispanic-American youngsters who had good grades, but never applied for college and nobody told them that they had to take the SATs in order to go to college. That may be an extreme example, but we have a serious problem, both with the availability of counseling and with the views of counselors themselves about what children can achieve.

One of the reasons I am conflicted about the whole question of the eligibility point for schoolwides is that certainly the institution wide, the schoolwide approach is needed every place, but poor kids in predominantly middle-class schools, the data show, the prospect studies show these kids succeed at a rate far greater than poor kids in high concentrated poverty schools. And why is that? Because the norm in the school is for success. It is communicated through the teachers. It is communicated through the parents. All of the kids talk about what college are you going to, not are you going to college, or what are you going to do, or are you thinking about dropping out.

And we have to think about what is it in those schools that really makes a difference, and it is the norms that are being said, it is the counseling that is available, it is the way students and families talk to each other. And so we have to look at the highest-poverty schools and say we cannot do everything. We cannot, unfortunately, create these kinds of schools every place, but what can we provide to make sure that kids know what their opportunities are and have the incentives and have the counseling to be able to move on.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baroudi.

Mr. BAROUDI. I think, again, those middle school students, and that is where I taught, they are at an age where their bodies are changing, new things are happening, they are beginning to feel more and more like adults or like they want to be adults and take on some of those responsibilities, and they have moved from, often, an environment that is sort of fun learning to an environment that sometimes moves them from class to class and is more of a didactic kind of old-style teaching, if you will.

I think that hands-on learning experience, you are learning sort of service learning. An idea of even mentoring, we talk about mentoring with new teachers, but mentoring from people within the community and matching them up with students, especially disadvantaged students who might not have role models in their own families and that type of thing, might provide a catalyst for bringing the meaning back to why am I learning this and what difference does it make, along with a sense of excitement about learning versus, "Gee, I have got to learn this to do well on the test, so that our school looks okay." Because I do not think that really translates to most 14-year-olds.

Ms. BERGESON. I met an engineer from Boeing who is in a volunteer program in our State working with a middle school boy, and we were having a discussion a couple of months ago, and he has turned that boy's life around, and that boy has turned his life around. He is in his late seventies and was kind of bored with being retired, and he was turned on to this kid, and he can be a role model in a very special way.

And we have 28,000 Boeing retirees just in the Seattle area, and they are smart cookies that have had very interesting careers and have the ability to reach out to kids. And just that connection turned the boy on.

The CHAIRMAN. Our European and Asian counterparts emphasize more skill training, and opportunities and work starting in the 6th grade and before. Are we lacking in that? [No response.] Does that mean the answer is a universal yes? [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know, Senator. I think certainly we have to prepare students vocationally, but I worry about sorting kids out too quickly. And I think the Europeans do sort the kids out too quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. I know that there is a fear our people seem to have, and yet the results of it seem to be so dismal with drop-outs and all, compared to the European and Asian counterparts.

Ms. BERGESON. You can have hands-on learning without tracking the kids. What the goal of our reform in Washington is to get the applied learning into every course, not just in vocational. We kind of used to have the "know" and the "do" courses. If I am going to college, I have got to know all of this stuff. If I am going to go right to work and be in vocational, I am going to do something with my hands. Well, it is hands, and head, and heart. It is all together, and it should be across the board in all courses, especially when you get to middle school kids.

The CHAIRMAN. When I talk to the business people here, there are thousands of jobs out there for high school kids—$10/$15 an hour jobs. But the students did not get the math, and the math is learnable by young people who may not want to go to college. So I think there is a real problem there, and I do not know how we address it through the Title I programs.

Mr. Riddle, do you have any thoughts?

Mr. RIDDLE. I did want to mention something about the middle schools earlier, just to get back to that topic for a second.

There has been some movement toward increasing Title I services in middle schools. The percentage is relatively low now compared to elementary, but it is higher than it used to be, and it is, in part, due to the rule adopted in the 1994 amendments that all schools, whatever their grade level, with 75 percent or more of their kids from low-income families, must be served; that you could no longer have 75-percent-plus middle schools, yet choose to put all of your Title I money into elementary schools. This rule has had a fairly substantial effect in increasing the focus of Title I money on middle schools.

Also, while there has strictly been a focus in most of the model programs for disadvantaged kids on elementary and pre-K programs, there are now efforts for many of them in extending them into at least middle schools, it is still the senior high school level where there is very little participation and very little emphasis currently in model programs.

I should also mention that children still served by Title I in middle school or high school are often the kids who were not successful, not well served by the elementary programs, they are often a more disadvantaged group and harder to reach.

Ms. BERGESON. And if you tie Title I, if you assume that Title I dollars are to help the children academically get reconnected or get connected properly in the first place, and then you tie it to things like the technology challenge grants and the School-to-Work initiatives, again, the package of resources that kind of get to the different parts of a kid's life, specifically with the technology, middle school kids are turned on with technology. In my State we have got a lot of middle school kids who are running the technology in the schools because the teachers are more scared of the equipment than the kids are. The kids live with it, and they love it.

So, as we expand our access to technology, you both have the learning opportunities for the kids, but for many of the students we are talking about, meaningful—in one of our schools we call it a meaningful work program, where the kids get jobs, and it is kind of what Lula was talking about on the after-school activities. If you want to do your job in school, which may be to boot up all of the programs for the elementary teachers to help run the wires in the school, we have got a lot of people in the high-tech world in our State, and guys that have come out and thought that kids in their own children's school needed a little help, and they taught the kids how to do a lot of the work.

So it started at the high school, but now we have got middle school kids who are really technically amazingly astute, and they love it, and they cannot do the work if they do not do their school work, and they have also got some skills, as you were talking about, Senator Jeffords, when they leave high school. We have got kids ready to go into $40,000-a-year jobs because of what they have learned about technology in their schools.

Now, that is not where I want them to end their education, working for Microsoft, I want them to circle back in again at some point and be life-long learners.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I guess I think that applied learning may be the key word. Building it into the curriculum and building in after-school opportunities rather than directing kids off into vocational programs.

My late wife was a judge here in the District of Columbia for 17 years, and she would come home sometimes when she was trying drug felony cases and talk about these youngsters who are high-school-aged kids who had all of these skills in mathematics, they were running drug businesses, and they were motivated to learn the business. And she thought some of them were talented kids were off in that area. If we could find ways to provide motivation in other areas through applied learning, I think we would be ahead of the game.

The CHAIRMAN. Another area I would like to discuss with you briefly is the utilization of the arts—music and the arts, especially in the middle grades as well. Studies all indicate that the kids that get involved in the arts and music do much better on SATs and other exams and all.

We were pretty heavy on the arts back in the early seventies/early eighties, and then all of a sudden there was a feeling, well, if you got to cut back on your budgets, the first thing to do is get rid of all of the stupid arts, and music and stuff. And now we realize that the arts was probably the best thing we were doing.

I was out just recently to listen to the DC. Youth Orchestra. It was wonderful. Gosh, they had moving performances by those kids. And I wonder whether we should not stop looking at them as being extracurricular activities, but looking at them as more pursuable and desirable activities.

Is there any utilization of Title I funds for those things? I do not expect so. But, Mr. Riddle?

Mr. RIDDLE. There is no indication of substantial use of Title I.

Mr. BAROUDI. In the old days under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, there were what were called enrichment activities, and they brought disadvantaged kids into contact with things like that, not necessarily in a participatory way, but just in terms of an experiential way. And I think those were very valuable experiences.

I think as long as Title I is not an entitlement, and we can only serve a small portion of the kids who actually end up being eligible, unless it gets into a schoolwide venue where the entire curricula is richly enhanced and supplemented with the arts, then I think, in a targeted assistance school, the money typically would not be spent there. Even with local decisionmaking, the voices of the public, the community would say you have got to do your reading and math first. That is my own interpretation of that.

But I think the brain research does say that kids who are involved in music and that type of thing early on, their brains develop differently, and they are more easily connecting to science, and math and things of that nature. So I would not preclude it, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. I just think, when you look at the drop-out rates, and that 80 percent of the people that are incarcerated are dropouts and all, our society suffers a huge loss by not keeping those kids in school and giving them reasons to stay. Certainly some of the best programs I observed were over in Russia called—the palaces of culture. They were just full of kids after school until 6 o'clock, and those kids were involved in music, and doing all sorts of extracurricular activities, like learning how to be astronauts. Of course, that has all fallen apart now.

Ms. FORD. I agree wholeheartedly. When I did not have enough money, and you wanted to use my Title I dollars, I would buy a person, not on staff, so that it would be a consultant who would come in and teach those skills to my children. Because when I immediately came to the school and knew we could not transform the school in 1 day in terms of 1 day, and I wanted some low-hanging fruit, I certainly entered my children into different kinds of artistic kinds of contests and music avenues.

So that brings a lot of pride into the school, and it brings pride into the community, and it certainly gives the children, as you said, another avenue. And once they know that they have a talent, they certainly soar. And once the family can understand that their children are in something, they would come after school with that child, would take that child away. So I think that we should look at those natural kinds of abilities and skills that our children have and expand on those in our Title I programs.

Ms. BERGESON. I think the biggest danger we face—I totally agree with your concern—I think the biggest danger we face with this whole standard's based reform, is that we will get so obsessed with making high test scores that we will think that we can just kind of drill and kill the kids into this. And you read things, and if you really love to read, you read stuff that you are interested in, the literature, the poetry, dancing, singing, the arts, it is not only an integrator of the curriculum, but in and of itself, it is just a thing of joy in our lives and richness in our lives.

And I think you could send a message from this level, from the Federal level, because that second role that I talked about early in my presentation about leveraging goals, both the arts and the whole area of kids that have gifts that are talented kids, if our whole reform ends up being only let us get our kids up to the bar here on the standard and not think about the quality of life and not think about the total range of kids, it is not going to succeed over time because life is much bigger than that.

Obviously, you cannot put a lot of Title I money into it, but you certainly can send messages with the whole combination of programs that you send out there not to lose this richness of culture and joy in kids' lives. It turns them on.

Ms. FORD. I was just going to say that they were called the Beethoven Ballerinas, and they certainly went around and performed for other organizations, and that brought such a tremendous pride to the school, and that program only cost me $9,000. But those were little girls whom we started in the third grade and brought them up all of the way up to 8th grade, and then they went into high school. But that brought so much joy when they would go out and perform around the community.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, back to the questions of my staff, having destroyed their direction. In terms of schoolwide projects, current law states that, in order to qualify as a schoolwide project, 50 percent or more of your students must be from low-income families. I know that many rural areas do not necessarily have 50 percent, but do come close to that percentage.

Mr. Baroudi, do you think it makes sense to perhaps have a two-tiered schoolwide program; one for rural areas and one for urban needs? And, if so, how would such a program be structured in terms of percentages and accountability mechanisms?

That is obviously a staff question. I would never think that one up. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAROUDI. Personally, the idea of a two-tier is sort of an us-them kind of situation which I think we are trying to get away from. I mean, in a schoolwide situation, all of the kids are ostensibly part of your caseload, and you have said that all of the kids are at the table. We are going to ensure that they have an opportunity to learn well. In fact, we are going to insist that they learn well and to a high standard, and we are going to do data on them every year to make sure that the disaggregated special population groups are keeping pace with everybody else.

I would, personally, not advocate a two-tiered system, but I would say that one of the highest uses of Ed Flex in Vermont has been to wave the 50-percent poverty level to allow schools to become schoolwide. Title I guidance allows for incidental inclusion of kids who are not in a caseload, and there are many small schools. Once you say you are going to become a schoolwide, ostensibly, what you are saying is this is incidental inclusion maybe of another 50 or 75 kids.

I think if, indeed, we are approaching things systemically, as I heard Terry so eloquently articulate is going on in Washington, many of the same things are happening in Vermont.

If we are saying that our professional development is tied to our curriculum, and individual professional development plans are tied to what has been identified as a need within the District through our action plans, then we are giving all of the teachers, hopefully, the same professional development level.

And I think that is just going to translate into a schoolwide, if, indeed—one of the things we have done is that we have required anybody who has gotten a waiver to connect with the State around their schoolwide plan, so that we can take a look at it, we can see if there is an investment in it, and we can see if there has been some, and not willingly, just areas that they have overlooked or omitted.

So I think with the State tying in that way, using their Ed-Flex authority in that way, I do not see any reason to have a two-tiered system.

Ms. BERGESON. I agree with that. I think if we had the flexibility in the State agency to give the waivers, and we will immediately be applying as soon as it is possible to be an Ed-Flex State—I just missed that with the 12 pilots—but like the waiver in Seattle, where they had a plan, and they showed they were getting the money to where the kids were, and they were disaggregating their test scores, so we knew what the results were with the kids, and then they were able to grant them a waiver from the Federal Government.

And I would rather see that floor of the 50 percent kept in place and exceptions have to come talk to you and show you what they are going to do to make sure the program works.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is not an easy one, Senator. The great virtue of schoolwides is that it directs attention to changing what is not working in the school rather than to identifying the child and pulling that child out of class and not having the child in the regular curriculum. So I am a great believer in schoolwides.

But as I mentioned a couple of minutes ago, I am a little bit worried about bringing down that percentage. I am speaking only for myself here, not for any of the organizations. Bringing down that percentage, the genius of Title I is that it is politically enough oriented that every congressional district and every school system gets some—practically every school system—gets some money. But there is always the danger of dilution and not targeting it to the students who need it most.

So I worry about waivers because waivers are so easily granted, in some cases. And I realize that under Ed Flex I do not have any evidence that they have been misused in bringing down schoolwides, but maybe we ought to be thinking about reducing that entry level only where the school is able to show that poor kids are having some problems and that this going schoolwide would really be calculated to bring about achievement. At least I would encourage us to think along those lines, rather than either having a dual system for poverty areas, unless it can be justified, or just saying, well, we will make this a matter for waivers. I think we need to have some standards that apply.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baroudi.

Mr. BAROUDI. I think the dilution factor, Bill, I am not sure what you mean by that, but if you mean dilution of money, my sense is that targeted and ranking kind of scenarios, because you do not get any more money for being a schoolwide, the money itself is not going to change, I do not believe, and so that is sort of a safeguard that I think the legislation has built in.

If you are talking about the dilution of services to this youngsters who are in a special populations group who may not be keeping pace, I think that is where the disaggregation and the annual, at least annual, revisitation of the data on how they are doing is critical. Because if that piece is missing, then you are right, it could very easily say that a school, "Oh, my goodness. Well, 80 percent of our students are doing really well, but the other 20 percent, my goodness, they are in a special population"—let us say they are the migrant students that are in that particular school—then that is unacceptable.

In our case, having given schoolwide status, the State could then take schoolwide status away from a school who was not performing in a manner that we felt was acceptable for that——

The CHAIRMAN. I understand what you are saying. I have a case out in St. Louis where kids are going from central city schools into county suburban schools, and 75 percent of them are poor. I do not know how many of those schools are eligible for Title I, but many of those kids are doing well in those schools, which are predominantly middle-class schools, without the assistance of Title I, I believe. I would not want to see the benefits diluted to the kids who are really in need of the services. I do not know, I think it requires more thought.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Ford.

Ms. FORD. Certainly, because Chicago, all of our schools are eligible for that, I would not like to see the 50 percent dropped. And one of the other reasons is because I do not think, once we start targeting children again, we do what we do not want to do, and that is pull them out, and when a child is pulled out to go to another kind of program, that child loses out on what is happening in that regular classroom, and I would like to see us remain there.

I would like to also echo what Mr. Taylor is saying when he says poverty children go into other situations. I think what he is failing to realize is that there are expectations there, and if we continue to hold our children to high expectations, they will rise to the occasion, and that is one of the things we wanted to do in our poverty-area schools is to make sure that we have high-quality standards for all of our children, and we have the quality staff development for the teachers. Then all of our children can begin to perform where we want them to perform, and that is the reason that those children are doing well in those schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Riddle.

Mr. RIDDLE. I would just mention that schoolwide programs, as currently conceived, are based on two assumptions; one, that in a very high-poverty school, all children are disadvantaged, and it is no longer terribly equitable to try to focus on just the most disadvantaged and, second, that the grant going to the school, since it is based on the number of low-income children going to the school, and that is a substantial percentage of the total, that that grant is sufficiently large to have some meaningful impact on the school overall.

Now, at some point, going down the scale of poverty rates, that logic no longer applies, although it is ultimately subjective at what point that is. I would also mention that when we are talking about schools and the percentage of kids in a school who are low income, we are usually talking about the percentage of kids who are free and reduced-price school lunch kids, not the Federal standard poverty rate, so a much more expansive threshold. And so a 50-percent school is only about a third above the national average rate, rather than being 2.5 times the national poverty rate; in other words, 50-percent schools are not super high-poverty schools, they are somewhat above average.

The CHAIRMAN. Professional development is an area we all are interested in as being essential.

Ms. Ford, I understand that Chicago has especially emphasized professional development activities. You mentioned the Chicago Teachers Academy. Would you describe in greater detail how the academy functions, what types of programs does the academy offer and how are these efforts impacting the classroom teaching.

Ms. FORD. Thank you. The Teachers Academy for Professional Growth is a collaborative effort between the Chicago Class Center, which is our union, and the Chicago Board of Education and with the University of Illinois, Champain, I am sorry, Circle Campus.

One of the things that we wanted to recognize, that oftentimes teachers who have been in the system for quite some time might not have gone back and gotten any courses. So we have asked principals to recommend those teachers to us who were—and I do not like to say the word "marginal"—but their children are not performing the way we think they should. We have what is known as a Teacher Renewal Center. Last year we got over 6,000 requests to come to that center, and that center we give best practices and strategies for math, reading, and writing.

We found that when the principal would certainly recommend the teacher—and it was not mandated, because we could not mandate—but it was certainly heavily requested, the teachers came in, and principals tracked them the next year, and we did see improved services for them.

We also have what—and our unions say that we must give staff development. We have a catalogue, which is collaborative with all of the departments in the Chicago public schools, and that is where we offer courses, and they are self-selected. But we have an overwhelming amount of teachers coming into that center.

One of the programs that we are most impressed with is our teacher induction mentoring program, and that is a program where we modeled it from our Teachers for Chicago, and that is where we had those mid-career people deciding that they wanted to come back into the system, and we wanted to give them an avenue that they would have—they had bachelor's degrees, and they might not have had the teaching courses that they needed in a college and university. We get an average of 1,000 applicants each year for our Teachers for Chicago Program. It is an alternative form of certification for them. Whereas, they would go with a mentor, they would have a mentor teacher assigned to them. They would take college courses in the afternoon, whatever they needed, and that is one of the most successful programs that we have had.

Last year, we offered a mentor to most new teachers that were in Title I schools. Because it is so successful, we are offering that mentoring program now. Next year we will offer it to every school in the city with a new teacher because that was one of the things that research told us; if you have a mentor for new teachers and that mentor is not self-selected by the principal, it is a collaborative process between the Teachers Academy and the colleges and universities that we work with, where they are not self-selected, so you could get your friend, but we are getting the best and the brightest to mentor these new teachers.

And we are not taking the mentor teacher out of the classroom. That mentor teacher comes either early in the morning or stays late in the afternoon to work with those teachers. They actually go into the classrooms and model for them because that is what we said in research on site.

The other one that we are so pleased about is the reading program that we are establishing. We are sending those teachers back to class. We got a list from our Human Resources Department showing us the schools where we had reading specialists in the schools. Quite a few of our underperforming schools did not have a reading specialist. So we sent those teachers back to become—they got 18 additional hours, which meant the State endorsed them in reading—and we sent those individuals back into their schools and offered certainly modeling to all of the other teachers in that course.

And we looked at what other big-cities were doing, and we found that we were doing more in terms of teacher mentoring and the reading program, in terms of urban cities.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baroudi, do you have a comment?

Mr. BAROUDI. I think professional development is critical. And if we go back to the lessons learned, one of the purposes of this reauthorization, I mean, it was just said that one of the lessons learned was that we did not provide enough professional development, and it was often missing in those schools where performance was not there. And so I think, as a State, we have embraced this whole idea. We are taking a look because we are so small, and many of our class sizes in the lower grades are below that 18 threshold under the class size reduction money. We are looking at ways to use on-site, as Lula said, mentors and professional development coaches to enhance professional development with that money.

So I cannot support professional development strongly enough and also encourage not only the teachers, but the legislation talks about administrators, it talks about paraprofessionals, it also talks about parents. So just broadening the lariat, if you will, to bring those folks in and make it part of that concentrated effort that Terry talked about when everybody in the school sort of agreed this is what we have to do, this is what we want to do, and here are the steps we are going to go to take it. And that is really what our Parent School Compact talks about or starts with. I just think we just need to broaden it a little bit more so that we are getting all of the parties and not just the teachers, but the teachers are certainly critical.

The CHAIRMAN. Moving down the line here, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I think, generally, we do not favor set-asides, but I think in this area Congress ought to consider perhaps upping the set-aside for professional development to as much as 20 percent and not confining it to schools that have already been designated in need of intensive improvement, but making it a more general requirement.

Also, I think there ought to be a way of distilling the kind of experience, and maybe this is happening widely, but that right now we say it is up to the school to decide what is a good professional development program, and certainly it ought to be up to the school. But to the extent that States and city school systems can provide guidance and best-practice information about professional development, I think that would be a very healthy thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Bergeson.

Ms. BERGESON. I agree with all of the comments. Our principals in our State are crying for help. We have a number of people that get into administrative careers, and they have not been primary teachers, and they are trying to look at their reading programs and their writing programs, and they really do not know what they are looking at, and whether they should have had that in their college training or not is another thing, and you are putting I think some accountability on the preparation programs, too, which I am very pleased to see because we have got to do this together. We have got to get the pre-service programs and the preparation programs beefed up to prepare for what we are trying to do in the schools.

So the school leaders, superintendents, district curriculum people and people in an agency like mine, we are changing our State education agency. We used to be a pretty hidebound bureaucracy, to say the least, and we are breaking the mold here. We are trying to be leaders and helpers. And many of my staff that have been out there just doing monitoring, need to get additional skills, in terms of what to look for, in the reading research.

We are all in the process of changing. And I think, if we are not all learners in this, as we figure out these new roles, we are not going to be able to leverage the change as quickly as we would like to at all levels of the system. So I agree with some of the set-asides and State capacity building, as well as the school teachers themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. You have mentioned principals, and that was going to be my next question. What kind of activity do you have for principals? In my observation, you find a good school, you find a good principal; you find a lousy school, you find a lousy principal.

In Washington here, I asked them to point out schools they wanted me to visit, and I went and there were fine principals. So then I decided I would go to the schools I wanted to look at, and I took the lowest-performing schools and went and visited them, and there was no question where the primary problem was—the principal.

What are we doing in your areas, or what should we be doing with Title I or with the ESEA, more generally, to put an emphasis, especially in the middle schools, on principal training?

What do you do, Ms. Ford? What do you have?

Ms. FORD. We have what is known as the CASL Program, which is the Chicago Academy for School Leadership. Three years ago, when Mr. Valez and Mr. Chico, the Reform Board, came aboard, we looked at State legislation.

When the first reform bill was passed in 1988 and they took away the written examination for principals, they then said you could have a Type 75, which meant there was no training. When Paul—Mr. Valez—and Mr. Chico came aboard, they found that this is where our problem was, with the principalship.

They went to the State legislature and asked if we could have an additional requirement, and it is called Senate bill 1019. We then added 70 clock hours to leadership for our principals. This is where we think that we have done an extremely fine job because now all of our principals are mandated to come in. At one time they could just, I call it, roll out of bed and become a principal because they could come from a third grade class or a kindergarten class and become a principal. Now, they cannot do that. You must have some other administrative background and you must have gone through the CASL program.

We, also, mandate that after you have gotten the principalship, you still have to have 32 hours biannually, so that you can continue with your contract, and that way we are ensuring that we are getting the instructional leaders that you need in a school.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me, though, with principals, that there are some people you could never teach to be a principal. And if you use a system that does not have a selection process with something other than going to a school, what should be or what is done or how do you identify a person who has the capacity to be a good principal?

I know it gets into problems with unions and all, but how do we break into that problem because, to me, these people have special talents that make them great principals.

Ms. BERGESON. We are breaking into it through the training and the selection process with our State Board of Education and our universities. We are just in the process of changing the standards that are there for the skills that a principal needs to have. We have certification standards, but they really are not directed at the kind of knowledge and skill that principals need to do the kind of change efforts that we are making in our State.

So we are in the process, with the Principals Association, and our State agency, and the State board, and the university administrative programs, of changing the way we train and select principals. So in a year or so I will be able to give you some detail on that.

The other thing that is happening—well, let me give you a homegrown example, in central Kitsap, where I worked as a school administrator before I got involved at the State level, it drove me crazy that we would let people just select their way into programs and then we would support them. And sometimes we would have candidates, and I would say, "You would not hire them..." this was me talking to my superintendent. I was in the cabinet-level staff. I said, "You would not hire this person to be a principal in our district," and our superintendent thought, well, they might want to have that opportunity because some other district, maybe in a rural area, might want it.

I said, "Well, why would we want them to be a principal anywhere if they cannot be a principal in our district?"

So there has to be a review of the whole structure of the governance of the profession and how we have people not only come into teaching, but come into principals' roles.

And then the other unique thing in Washington that is just beginning that I am excited about is that we have a technology alliance in our State. Bill Gates' dad, whose name is also Bill Gates, leads this foundation. And we are going to have laptop computers for every single principal, and every superintendent and my cabinet at the State agency over the next three summers. They will have the computer. They will be on-line in kind of a chat page and Internet access site for school administrators. They will get some intensive training in the use of technology for their management roles and some of their instructional leadership roles.

We think that over the next 3 years we are going to have a network where principals can access each other. Principals and other school administrative leaders will be tied together, will be able to put all of the reform information on-line with them, and I think this is going to be the vehicle for all of the other changes we are doing, to really be able to scale that up across our total State, no matter where they work.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Two additional points, Mr. Chairman. One is do not be afraid to involve parents in the process of selection. They can often spot leaders as well as other administrators can, and I think they ought to have a role, and too often in poorer schools they do not have very much of a role and, second, do not be afraid to say one has made a mistake. That is what accountability is all about, and reconstitution of schools, and reconstitution of schools means that if a principal is not getting results, that principal ought to be replaced, and we ought to confront the problem of State laws and collective bargaining agreements that say principals have building tenure because they ought not to have building tenure.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baroudi.

Mr. BAROUDI. I think you are correct in saying that the principal is the key in individual schools. Certainly, that has been my experience. I introduced Sue McGuire, a woman you met down in Molly Stark School on Bennington, as the straw that stirs the drink, which is what was said of Reggie Jackson when he went to the New York Yankees. But without that dynamic, critical leadership, certainly schools that otherwise might prosper seem to founder.

And I think in Vermont what we see is a turnover rate that is unacceptable, both at the principal level and the superintendent's level. And that, to me, says not all of these people look at being a principal as being a job. My sense is most of them are called to it. This is a calling for them. Because if it is not, they are definitely going to not be there very long because it is a very demanding kind of work.

And if it is done right, I think it is a very rewarding kind of work. But I think somewhere along the line, we have either lost them in our peripheral vision or somehow just not been able to meet their needs, and I am just eager to see what Terry comes up so that maybe we can borrow from mit.

Ms. BERGESON. Senator Jeffords, the Chiefs, as an organization, we have really taken on professional development and teacher and school leader quality as a theme over the last couple of years in our organization. And as you look at the policy decisions you want to make here, it is kind of framing it so you could encourage some collaborations and sharing of information among States because different States have different processes.

What we are looking for is the most exemplary practices; things like what the National Commission on Teaching are talking about with partner States that are looking at the way they recruit, and train, and retain, and allow some career differentiation in the profession, both at the school level and for teachers and principals.

So we would be glad to work with you in terms of kind of a framework to encourage some breakthroughs in changing these policy structures at the State level. If you try to do too much with this here, you are going to really get in a mess. But it is where the State kind of governance structures, we have got to get smarter about how we do that, and I think we can learn from each other with your encouragement—even without your encouragement, but it would be great to have your encouragement.

The CHAIRMAN. I apologize for keeping you here so long, but I am going to keep you a little longer, if that is all right. Anybody that has to bail out or anything, let me know.

Ms. Ford, I wanted to chat with you a little bit about academies and the summer schools and after school. I know how critical those are, and I observed some wonderful examples in your city and would like you to share those with us.

Ms. FORD. Thank you. As you know, last year we had the most ambitious summer school program in the country. We had over 250,000 young people in summer school. Some of them certainly were a part of our Bridge Program, which was our bench-mark grades, 2nd and 4th grade, and 5th grade. Because we test at 3rd and 6th grade, and we wanted to make sure that those youngsters, where their reading scores were low, we wanted to make sure that they got all of the intervention that they needed. And the teachers are now saying that that was a tremendous boost for those youngsters coming back in 3rd grade, and we will see the results of this this year when we test those youngsters who were 2nd grade and needed the additional services.

Our after-school program is such a tremendous boost, not only for the children, but for the communities at large. We know that research has told us that from 3 o'clock to 6 o'clock that is where our young people get into the most difficulty. Because we have the extended program and 1 hour extended program—we have a 2-hour extended program in the Chicago public schools, and 1 hour is certainly subject related and the other hour is recreational. In some instances, we actually serve a meal to those youngsters who need it.

There has been so much growth in the community and in those schools, that I could not—just to preface my own school, and I keep saying my own school, but my school before Beethoven, that was when my children got all of the additional growth that they needed to advance. My teachers came to me after the first year, and that is when our scores doubled, and said, "I taught skills that I had never taught before."

When we think of the school day as being only 300 minutes, and we do not think of the fact that the children go to recess, go to the bathroom, go to gym, we are talking about a lot of time lost. And what research tells us, we need more time on task. And especially for those Title I children who are in low-income areas, it is certainly helping us bridge the gap with them in the communities.

The extended day and the Bridge Program, not only in the elementary school, we have it in our high school. We offered it to our 9th and our 10th graders, and we are going to offer it to our 11th graders this year. If they fail a subject, they no longer will have to wait until they graduate or pay for these courses. We offer these courses to them, and it has been so tremendous for them because they will not wait until that end of the year.

Oftentimes, our children would drop out after 10th grade, because if they had failed 3 subjects, they would say, "I cannot make this up." So now we are offering it to them at the Bridge Program and the summer school. The Summer Bridge Program is certainly costing us a lot of money, but they made a commitment to these children, and the district is paying for that out of their district dollars. That commitment has certainly been great to our school system and to our young people.

The CHAIRMAN. Any comments? Others?

Ms. BERGESON. Just one thing, I think that is wonderful. I would like to talk to you about your summer school program. But one thing I would add is the before-school program in Mount Vernon, in our State, we have a lot of migrant children that are in the valley in the Mount Vernon area, and they started up a Sunrise Program. So the children come in and have breakfast at 8:00, and they can bring their moms with them, or whoever they want, and they get the reading lesson at 8:00 that they will get in class at 9:00. And the best way to avoid remediation is to do preteaching.

So the kids get the whole lesson, and they have their breakfast, they go to school, and then the teacher says, "Well, does anyone know this word?" and all the kids raise their hand that have never been able to raise their hands before. Not only is their academic achievement going up, but what blew my mind and was so exciting is that the other children get to like these kids. They are players now. They get to raise their hand. They get to have heard that word. And oftentimes because of the mobility of their life, they have not had that chance in the past.

So those, in addition to the after-school and the summer school, there is all kinds of creative designs.

The CHAIRMAN. Before school.

Ms. BERGESON. Yes, before school—pre-step.

Mr. RIDDLE. I would mention that the extended learning time has always been an important concept in Title I, whether after school or before school or during the summer. However, it has relatively rarely been provided. The latest data is that, while a substantial number of districts are offering extended learning time, only a small minority, about 12 percent, I believe it is, of Title I pupils are getting extended learning time. It is increasingly important with districts, as in Chicago, that are making efforts to eliminate social promotion that almost inevitably means extended learning time for the disadvantaged pupils to meet the standards and increases the importance of that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a good point.

Mr. BAROUDI. I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that Lula sort of mentioned in passing that they feed youngsters when necessary, and I think that is a critical part of that extended-year program. It is going on in your home city of Rutland right now with their summer activities through Title I, and I did not want it to get missed. I just wanted to just say that nutrition piece I think is critical in a lot of instances.

Ms. BERGESON. We call it "Feed and Read."

The CHAIRMAN. Just to let you know, I am going to hold a hearing on retention and take a look at the long gaps in the summer and the impact it has on education. I'd like to look toward the European-Asian models of never more than 30-day gap in the schools, so you do not get the retention problems of having the kids start over again when they return.

Does anyone have comments on that? I know it is a politically sensitive one if you start fooling around with the summer off.

Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad you raised the subject. I think one of the dangers in this debate that is going to take place is getting caught up with catch words. The fact is that when you get a child in the 3rd or 4th grade who has not learned to read well, there are no good options either in keeping that child back and having the child repeat the grade or in allowing the child to go forward. And it seems to me that Title I and its emphasis on reform, and on early childhood learning and on effective instructional strategies in the early grades is the key to limiting the number of children who arrive in the 4th grade unable to read well.

Where children do, I do not think it is necessary to hold them back a whole grade. I think after-school, I think intensive learning, I think summer school, and I have not thought enough about whether you change the whole structure to limit that learning gap. It is an interesting idea. But those are the things that can be done and can be done on an intensive basis that should convert—that is different from the idea of just having a child repeat the whole grade.

I do not think putting $400 million or $600 million in after-school programs saying provided we do not have social promotions is going to solve the problem, and I am not sure there is anybody who thinks that that is where it ought to go. The answer really is in applying that $8 billion well to prevent the learning deficits from arising in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Ford, do you have a comment?

Ms. FORD. Certainly. Well, let me say retention, and that is one of the reasons we have a Bridge Program, and a summer and the after-school extended day. It is for those youngsters who, in some instances, need retention. But I would like to say that oftentimes our children were lethargic, and their parents equally so, in that they knew that if they got to 8th grade and were 15, they would graduate anyway. So we had to look at those youngsters, and they told us this the first year, Senator, that they had not applied themselves because they knew that at 15 years old they were going to go into high school.

Once Mr. Valez and the Reform Board of Trustees decided that there were going to be some consequences, our children began to step up to the plate, and we offered transition centers for those children who were not successful, and we gave them all of those intensified kind of help and best practices.

And I feel that once the parents and the children know, and the schools are accountable, then they will do something about this retention piece. I think that what we have done, ending social promotion protects society in general and poor children. And I recommend that if that is what is needed—we did not just tell the child that they were retained, we gave them the best teachers, and we gave them all of the resources needed to move them to the next level, and we also gave them another opportunity, making the grade. These young people who failed 3rd grade will possibly get a chance to go to summer school. It will be intensive, 6 weeks, all day, and if they are promoted, they can go to the 4th grade with their regular classes.

So we are not just holding them back. We are offering them an opportunity to make up all of the time necessary, and we are giving them every intervention necessary to help them.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not sure how wide our disagreement is. Because to the extent there is intensive work going on, I think that is the answer and not making the child repeat the whole school year.

I am on something called the Board of Testing and Assessment, which is an arm of the National Academy of Science, which you can see I am overly affiliated, but they recently came out with a report called "High Stakes" that I think you probably have. But I think that it is the best thing that has been done to summarize the research in these areas, including the area of so-called social promotion. So I commend it to the committee, and to the staff, and people who helped on this, like Lori Shepherd, I think are people the committee——

Ms. BERGESON. She is good. She is very good.

Mr. TAYLOR. The committee may want to draw on as you look at this issue.

Ms. BERGESON. You know, it is kind of like it is a system thing, Senator Jeffords. I know, since we started the accountability in Washington, and we are early in this game, earlier than Vermont and earlier than Kentucky, but we are getting there. The biggest accountability is information to your local parents that kids are not meeting a standard on a State assessment that people care about, and by goodness, you start having a whole different kind of convention. And our districts are coming up with promotion policies, and some of the better ones they have multiple strategies such as Lula has been talking about of really giving the parents and the kids a lot of forewarning.

And the kids are cool. They know if we let them get away with it, they are going to get away with it. We have been letting them get away with too much stuff for a long time.

Kennewick School District, in my State, put a promotion policy together for their middle school kids, and the first summer they had 450 kids that could not go on to the next grade without having summer school. And by the end of the summer, they still had 100 kids left.

The second year they had it in place, the kids were listening up, and there were fewer kids that needed to have the summer program because they knew that we were getting serious as adults. But it is very tricky business, and it is something that the further you are away from the problem, the harder it is to come up with solutions.

And so it is the local community, knowing that they are going to have to be accountable for their kids, and then having, again, the support of resources and policy at this level that bolsters that effort to show the kids we love them enough that we want them to be ready for their life.

The CHAIRMAN. This is my last question. I am concerned, and I know others are, that Departments of Education in our universities and colleges are not really taking a look at their curricula and examining it relative to modern changes and needs, and that the new teachers that are coming out really have not had the kind of education they should have had when they come to the schools. So you may not get pinned down, is there anybody that disagrees with that?

Ms. BERGESON. No. They are starting. In my State, they are starting, but there is clearly a problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I know the President is concerned about this, too, and I will be working with him as well. And also Dr. Gregorian of the Carnegie Foundation is working with me on this project. I am going to be meeting with the presidents of my colleges and universities in Vermont and in some of the neighboring States next month to talk with them. I looked through, I do not know how many, but maybe a dozen curricula, and I found not one mention of a Goals 2000 or anything about the use of technology.

Ms. BERGESON. You have got it.

The CHAIRMAN. And nothing about the problems of today.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, you know, I think Congress made a good start last year in the Higher Education Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And it is beginning to stimulate more of a response from the schools of education. But there is really so much to be done not only to get people up to speed with modern technology, but to produce capable, certified teachers. I do not think I have the answers to those questions, but in some places we are getting teachers who are products of the same school systems that shortchange kids teaching in the schools, and we get the cycle repeating itself, and they come out of these local teachers colleges. Somehow we have got to try to draw people into teaching, give them the skills.

I taught at the School of Education at Stanford, and they turn out very few classroom teachers. I mean, the same thing with Teachers College at Columbia. Maybe some of these schools need to be induced to make it a greater part of their mission turning out the most capable teachers and showing that we value classroom teaching. We no longer have, as you know, Senator, we no longer have the captive pool that we once had of women and people of color who turned to teaching because they were discriminated against in other areas.

So we have got to figure out some very innovative approaches, and we have got to get some of these institutions, including the schools of education, to change the way they do business.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Ford?

Ms. FORD. I certainly agree wholeheartedly. And, Senator, oftentimes we think about people who are going into high-poverty areas. At one time, I think there was a waiver of fees or scholarships, and I think that we should revisit that issue. If people are going, if they are coming to a college on a loan, that loan should be revisited if they—should be waived, rather, if they are in a high-incident area. And I certainly would like to see the ACT scores or the SAT scores raised for teachers, or potential teachers, and the preservice program should begin immediately. We should not wait until 6 weeks of student teaching. I think preservice should begin in the freshman year.

And oftentimes we need to go back and try to home grow our own. I had a few at the Teachers Club that was a part of a college and university. Whereas, we looked at those bright—and I looked at my brightest young people, and they got into that Future Teachers Club, and they began to do tutoring on their own with the young people, and they said, "Oh, teaching is very difficult," and I said, "It certainly is."

We looked at those children, and we tracked some of them, and I think this year we are looking at a—I do not know what percentage—actually going into the teaching field. So we need to begin to home grow our own teachers, and that is one of the ways we are going to write for our National Science Foundation grant. It is going to be a collaborative effort.

And we are going to try to identify our brightest math and science people earlier from our high schools so that we would attract them into the colleges and make sure they come out as teachers. We will not be getting a recycled one like Mr. Taylor is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you all very, very much. I held you a long time, but I have gotten an awful lot out of it and deeply appreciate your involvement in the whole field and your love of teaching. So we are going to do the best we can to help make it a little bit better.

[Additional statements and material supplied for the record follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JUNE M. HINCKLEY

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to present this statement for the record on the issue of education for disadvantaged youth. My remarks focus on the vital role that music education can play in dramatically improving academic achievement and building self-esteem, discipline, and other skills necessary for success.

A critical premise behind Title I programs is that all children, regardless of race or economic background, are entitled to the highest quality education this country can provide. All children must be given the opportunity and the tools to learn. Music training is one such tool.

There is an exciting and growing body of research that indicates that music instruction provided by the public schools can have positive effects on childhood brain development. This research documents the link between music education and improvements in children's spatial/temporal ability (necessary for solving complex math and science problems), critical thinking skills, and knowledge retention. There also is research that supports the important role of music and the other arts in keeping students in school, particularly at the high school level. For many disadvantaged students, participation in music programs helps to break the cycle of failure they have so often encountered in life.

While study after study demonstrates that participation by disadvantaged children in a well-developed, sequential music program can be extremely beneficial academically, socially, and emotionally, these are the very students who are most often denied access to music instruction. Middle- and upper-income parents who have the resources are able to provide private music instruction for their children if necessary. But disadvantaged children do not have that luxury and are denied access to the benefits of music education if their schools do not provide it. Because of the misperception that music and the other arts are "frills," these programs are the first to be eliminated when school budgets are restricted. The problem is most acute in poor urban and rural areas. The result is that disadvantaged students are denied the intellectual stimulation and hands-on learning experiences that are an inherent part of instruction in the arts.

Even when a school does offer music education programs, disadvantaged children face yet another barrier. Music class is often the period chosen for underachieving youth to receive tutoring to improve their test scores. It is ironic and unfortunate that despite the scientific research showing that sequential music instruction can have a positive impact on learning in the very areas measured by standardized tests, these young people are removed from their music classes for skill and drill work. Again, this practice is especially prevalent in schools that have been designated as Title I schools.

We are in danger of creating a cultural caste system with these practices. Suburban, middle class youth have the opportunity to create and make music (and reap the resulting academic and social benefits) while our underprivileged youth do not. This is especially troublesome because so many disadvantaged youth are also of African-American or Hispanic heritage, and their cultures have so richly contributed to the music-making heritage of the United States. The traditions of jazz, salsa, the blues, and other music forms have their roots within the African-American and Hispanic societies of this country, but the children of these cultures often have no opportunity to learn about this music. It is a travesty that one of the most influential products of their culture is not a part of their education. Our schools should be a major source of passing along our country's cultural heritage. Yet, Title I schools systematically deprive their students of access to music education, to the detriment of these students and our society as a whole.

Music and the other arts are core academic subjects and have been recognized as such by Congress and the Administration in GOALS 2000. Consequently, music instruction must be part of every child's education. Special efforts are needed to make certain that disadvantaged students have the same access to comprehensive, balanced, and sequential instruction in music as students in more affluent districts.

MENC proposes that Congress undertake the following initiatives to address this critical issue:

Work with MENC to identify school programs that are making successful use of music with disadvantaged children to determine how and what they are doing that has led to their success and how these programs can be replicated throughout the country;

Identify and target Title I schools that are having the greatest difficulty in implementing and retaining school music programs and develop strategies for directing Title I funding to those schools in order to assist them in establishing these programs;

Encourage research to expand the work already being done on the impact of music study on spatial/temporal skills to examine the impact on language cognition and other areas that have not yet been widely investigated; and

Provide adequate funding to ensure that substantive music instruction is part of all HeadStart programs.

A recent publication from MENC entitled, "Music and Students At Risk: Creative Solutions for a National Dilemma," offers additional information about the research on the positive impact of music study on disadvantaged youth, as well as possible solutions for improving access to music programs for this group of children. MENC would be pleased to furnish the Committee with copies of the document. We stand ready to work with the Committee and the entire Congress to address this critical problem and find solutions that work in all our schools for all our children.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FRANCES RAUSCHER

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am Dr. Frances Rauscher, Assistant Professor of Cognitive Development at the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh. I am pleased to have this opportunity to present this statement for the record on the issue of education for disadvantaged children. My work with at-risk youth and my research on the link between music, the brain, and intelligence, may prove useful to you as you examine and reform federal education policies and programs.

At-risk children score lower on standardized tests than other children. In particular, researchers have suggested that the failure to develop abstract reasoning represents the most glaring deficiency of at-risk children. Several studies have found marked improvement in children's abstract reasoning following music training. Abstract reasoning is considered a separate component of human intelligence and is considered essential to scientific and mathematical thought. Studies overwhelmingly suggest that music training provided by the public schools can have lasting effects upon the developing brain—effects which may produce improved performance in certain intellectual domains, particularly those relevant to mathematics and science.

Children are born with all the nerve cells, or neurons, they will ever have. However, connections between neurons, called synapses, are sparse and unstable. Synaptic connections largely determine adult intelligence. During the first six years of life, the number of synapses increases dramatically, and synapses already in place are stabilized. This process occurs as a result of experience or learning. Those synapses that are not used are eliminated, a "use it or lose it" situation. Music training appears to develop the synaptic connections that are relevant to abstract thought.

A series of recent neurophysiological studies finds that the brains of musicians are different than those of nonmusicians, particularly if the musicians began their music lessons before age nine. For example, the membrane that divides the right and left hemispheres of the brain, the corpus callosum, is larger in musicians than in nonmusicians, as are the areas of the brain responsible for processing auditory and motoric information. This suggests that the human brain actually grows as a function of music instruction, provided the instruction begins early in life. It seems clear that this relationship between music training and brain development is reflected in improved cognitive processing.

Research conducted by my colleagues and I indicates that instruction in music can develop abstract reasoning. In a study published in Neurological Research, middle income and at-risk children provided with keyboard lessons scored significantly higher on abstract reasoning tests than children matched in IQ and socio-economic status who were provided with computer lessons or no lessons—34 percent higher, to be exact. The at-risk children, who characteristically score low on these types of tests, benefited the most from the music instruction.

A more recent study with kindergarten children demonstrated that this remarkable improvement can be found with children in a public school setting. Kindergarten children were taught the keyboard in the classroom in groups of ten. Again, the improvement in abstract reasoning following keyboard lessons was in the 48 percent range when compared to children who did not receive the lessons. These effects have been replicated in independent laboratories, and are quite robust. In fact, the enhancements are still present following one year after the lessons have terminated, although children who received the lessons for two years score even higher. It seems that consistent instruction in music is necessary for lasting enhancements.

I am currently conducting a five-year program of research at ten Head Start sites in Northeastern Wisconsin. Young children are being provided with music lessons, computer lessons, or no lessons. We tested a very broad range of abstract reasoning abilities before the lessons began, and are now in the process of retesting the children. The data collected so far indicate that only the music lessons have again improved the children's abstract reasoning skills, particularly those skills relating to mental imagery. Mental imagery is perhaps the most important aspect of abstract thought. Researchers have shown that we are unable to reason clearly about an idea for which we do not possess a mental image. Thus, mental imagery is relevant to decision-making, scientific, and artistic thought. It seems clear that children with adequate abilities in this area are more likely to function successfully in their lives and as adults.

What are the implications of this research for education policy? There is strong evidence to suggest that music instruction produces measurable structural and functional changes in the development of children's brains, resulting in significant educational benefits. Providing this instruction to at-risk children will enable them to compete on a more equal basis with their middle-income peers. I suggest that early childhood education in music should be an integral part of a coordinated set of public policies designed to address the needs of low-income children.

I am available to any member of the Committee to answer questions about my research and would be pleased to assist you as you consider legislation to strengthen educational opportunities for disadvantaged children.

FIRST IN THE WORLD

A Legislative Proposal for Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act; Authority for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement; and Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

ACTION: REAUTHORIZE ESEA, THE AUTHORITY FOR OERI, AND GOALS 2000 THROUGH LEGISLATION THAT EMBODIES A COMPREHENSIVE VISION

OF FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS AND TARGETS FOR PRE-EMINENCE OF AMERICAN STUDENTS, SCHOOLS AND SYSTEMS IN THE 21ST CENTURY. These goals include educational excellence for all students, acceleration of student achievement, and quality in the classroom. States and localities should set targets for reaching the goals, have in place comprehensive reform plans and strong accountability systems for measuring progress, and be given adequate opportunity to integrate federal funds and programs with similar federal initiatives, as well as with state and local resources, to reach their objectives.

Background. For two centuries Congress and the President have acted to assist states and localities in meeting national educational challenges. Federal funds, which comprise but a small percentage of total spending for education, have been targeted to specific purposes, yet controlled by states and localities which have primary responsibility for education. These national challenges and targeted purposes constitute the federal role to——

- Assist states in setting high standards, developing assessments, and planning and implementing strategies for school improvement;
- Provide targeted assistance to enable states and localities to better serve student populations, such as children in poverty or who lack proficiency in English;
- Support specific reform initiatives in critical subject areas, such as math and science, in the use of new technologies, and in professional and curriculum development; and
- Support research and development and testing to obtain state-by-state, national and international comparisons.

Throughout the two centuries of federal support for education, Congress has designated constitutionally and statutorily established state education authorities to administer federal education programs. This structure serves the nation well because it——

- Places responsibility on the education authorities at the state level for planning, setting priorities, and providing quality control and reporting on state and local use of federal funds;
- Enables state education authorities to link their own state resources with federal funds to enhance the impact of the funds;
- Places administrative responsibility for federal funds close to local education authorities, minimizing the need for federal oversight and administrative bureaucracy.

Context. The 1994 restructuring, of ESEA, complemented by enactment of Goals 2000, enhanced the coherence, coordination, flexibility and accountability of federal elementary-secondary programs. The following provisions of the 1994 legislation are essential and strongly supported

z' elements of the vision this Congress must build on and expand for the 21st century in its reauthorization of ESEA——

- Structuring, federal K–12 support around key national goals and priorities in education;
- Focusing all federal K–12 programming on high standards and expectations for all students with a new basis for accountability student achievement to those standards;
- Connecting all planning and use of federal K–12 funds to state and local plans and accountability systems for comprehensive educational reform and school improvement; and
- Streamlining, administration of federal K–12 support through a single comprehensive plan, consolidated applications, state and local waiver authority, and schoolwide use of funds for integrated instructional services to target populations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Three "First in the World" Goals. Cluster the current programs of ESEA, Goals 2000 and OERI under the following, three goals——

1) The Goal of Excellence in Student Achievement. The objective is for all states and localities to have standards, assessments, accountability systems, and strategies that result in student performance which is second to no nation in the world. The federal role is to support states and localities in these efforts, as well as to provide leadership in research and development, national and international assessments and data collection.

2) The Goal of Acceleration of Student Achievement. The objective is for all students identified as needing additional and supplemental resources to accelerate their learning to achieve to high standards, to be assisted through additional federal funds. The federal role is to enhance equity of opportunity for all students and close

the gap in performance between those needing special assistance and other students.

"Identified students" include those now eligible for various federal programs under the terms economically and educationally disadvantaged, migrant, immigrant, limited English proficient, Native American, Hawaiian, homeless, etc. States and localities must assure opportunity through specific plans of services and targets of performance for identified students to meet the same standards established for all students.

Title I and the other programs targeted to these identified students would be clustered under this Goal. The current provisions and components of Title I would be retained, including program improvement, schoolwide projects, comprehensive school reform, and Even Start. The Reduced Class Size and 21st Century After School programs would be added as components of Title I as well.

3) The Goal of Quality in the Classroom. The objective is for all schools to build their capacity and lift student performance to internationally-competitive standards, particularly in schools with high concentrations of low performance by identified students. The essential role of the federal government under this goal is to help states and localities leverage and foster improved student learning. States and localities would set measurable goals for quality indicators, such as teacher supply and credentials for professional development, to evaluate progress toward their targets in five priority areas related to quality in the classroom.

Funding. The funding target to realize the three objectives is to raise the federal investment for the programs under reauthorization from the current 4 percent of the over $300 billion spent nationally on public elementary and secondary education to 5 percent. Of the total program, 4 percent would be allocated for programs under Goal 1 Excellence; 75 percent for Goal 2 Acceleration; and 21 percent for Goal 3 Quality in the Classroom. State education agencies would use up to 1 percent of Goal 2 Funds for administration of these programs and use up to 2.5 percent for program improvement. Up to 15 percent of Goal 3 funds would be used by the SEA, including 3 percent for administration, 7 percent for state leadership and direct services to LEAs and schools, and 5 percent for competitive or directed local grants.

Structure of the Act. The current programs of ESEA, Goals 2000, and OERI would be included within the "clusters" under the three goals. Programs grouped within each goal (or priority under Goal 3) could be consolidated at state and local option, and plans would show how activities across functions are integrated and focused on quality in the classroom. Those parts of programs clustered under Goal 4. Excellence for use by localities and states could be consolidated according to the local or state comprehensive plans, or continued as separate categorical programs. In the case of Goal 2. Acceleration, the plans would enable the consolidation Of funds at the school level through an integration of instructional services to eligible students. Programs under Goal 3. Quality in the Classroom would be clustered under 5 priorities or functions and could be consolidated within each priority: Professional Development, Learning Technology, School-by-School Improvement, Safe and Drug-Free Community Schools, and School Modernization.

Congress and the Administration could merge some programs in the reauthorization. The remaining programs would be appropriated by category, thereby enabling Congress and the Administration to set nationwide priorities among the purposes by targeting appropriations and revising future reauthorizations. Impact Aid would remain a separate program.

Comprehensive Reform Plans. States and localities have comprehensive educational reform or school improvement plans which are the basis for their use of funds under Goals 2000 and/or ESEA, particularly Title 1. Under the new Act, these plans would be reviewed, updated, and consolidated to specify how each goal would be achieved. Plans for use of federal funds would be related to each state's comprehensive reform plan, and would be part of each state's application which would be subject to approval by the Secretary of Education. The plan for Goal 1 would address state and local progress toward establishment of high standards for all students, alignment of assessments, curricula and professional development with the standards, and access to research/technical assistance to attain educational excellence. The plan for Goal 2 would indicate how federal funds will be used to accelerate student achievement and close the gap for those students identified under Goal 2, including targets and benchmarks for assessing their progress. The plan for Goal 3 would specify how state and local capacity to enhance quality in the classroom will be improved by addressing each priority, again, with targets and quality indicators for each.

Accountability. Accountability for use of federal funds would be directly based on (1) the net change in the performance of identified student populations toward local and state standards, no matter what mix of federal programs the state or locality applied to the population group, and (2) state and local progress toward their goals for each priority of quality in the classroom. Annual progress reports toward their goals for student achievement, acceleration of student achievement, and the priorities under quality in the classroom would be required.

Consolidated Applications and Audits. Each state and local district would submit a single, consolidated application for use of federal funds under its comprehensive plan for all three goals. The required annual reports would be on a consolidated basis. USED would adopt consolidated auditing to conforming with the use of funds for purposes within goals or priorities.

Flexibility. The need for waivers is lessened by the new option for states and localities to consolidate programs clustered around a single goal or priority and to address program purposes comprehensively in that portion of their plans. Ed flex would be expanded to any state taking the option, on the following conditions: 1) that the state's accountability systems are fully in place—including standards, assessments, and student performance goals—as part of an approved comprehensive reform plan; and 2) that the state is fully implementing its responsibilities under Title I, including the identification of schools in need of improvement and provision of supports and resources to implement plans for the lowest performing schools and schoolwide projects. States and local districts would continue to include any requests for waivers of other provisions of ESEA in their comprehensive reform plans and consolidated applications.

Participation of Non-public School Students within Constitutional Limits. Students in non-public schools should participate under all three goals. ESEA, especially in the form of Title L is a sound alternative to vouchers. For thirty years federal support for elementary and secondary education has served and benefited eligible students in both public and non-public schools. with accountability and targeting. This reauthorization must continue ESEA in its appropriate role of support for all American students.

Assistance to Extra-State Jurisdictions. Continue current eligibility and set-asides for extra-state jurisdictions.

Impact Aid. Federal funding for education where actions of the federal government, such as location of a military base, impact localities and their schools should be continued. Impact Aid would be reauthorized as a separate program. Of special importance is continuation of Section 8009, which permits a state, under clearly delineated and limited circumstances, to take basic Impact Aid payments into consideration in allocating state aid to local districts.

Programs Not Included. Vocational Technical Education; School Nutrition; IDEA; HEA are not in this reauthorization.

CONCLUSION: These goals and concepts represent a substantial new vision for federal support to education. They focus strongly on three goals and purposes for federal funding and recast current programs related to performance targets and improved accountability. Our Council is prepared to assist the Administration and Congress in every way to establish a new direction for federal action which will help our students become "first in the world".

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:17 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○

ISBN 0-16-058403-5
90000
9 780160 584039